University of Alberta

Caedmon Records, the Cold War, and the Scene of the American Postmodern

by

Sarah Parry ©

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

in

English

Department of English and Film Studies

Edmonton, Alberta

Spring 2006

Library and
Archives Canada

Published Heritage
Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque et
Archives Canada

Direction du
Patrimoine de l'édition

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence
ISBN: 0-494-14024-0
Our file Notre référence
ISBN: 0-494-14024-0

NOTICE:
The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

AVIS:
L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

Canada

Abstract

Caedmon Records, the first company to specialize in recording the spoken word, and poetry in particular, was founded by Barbara Holdridge and Marianne Mantell in March 1952. While Dylan Thomas was the first poet Holdridge and Mantell recorded, Caedmon soon began to release LP records of modernist poets including T.S. Eliot, Marianne Moore, William Carlos Williams, e. e. cummings, Gertrude Stein, Ezra Pound, Wallace Stevens and Edith Sitwell. Drawing on interviews with its founders, a close examination of its catalogue and other primary documents, this dissertation offers a history of the Caedmon enterprise. It draws on techno-materialist theorists in order to locate that enterprise within the context of a postwar media shift from a culture of reading to a culture of secondary or technologized listening. The publication of the voice of the poet was central during this period of media shift when the record press emerged as a postmodern supplement to the printing press (the defining technology of the modern period) as a language reproduction machine.

This dissertation recovers the role of the LP in postwar and Cold War cultural history. It examines the spoken word LP as a synthesis of politically polarized prewar media systems. It also examines the differences between modern and postmodern sound within the context of the divide between partial and full sound spectrum sound recording that underwrote the postwar "audio revolution." Of particular interest are such historical forces as the social aging of poetry during wartime, the politicization of reading during the Cold War, the censorship of modern writing within America during the early fifties, and the postwar scene of mass culture as mandated by UNESCO. As historical agents and publishers of the spoken word, Holdridge and Mantell influenced the disposition of

the LP and shaped the reproduction of "modernism" as the content of postmodern media systems. More broadly, the Caedmon catalogue was shaped by the antifascist and anticommunist disposition—or political unconscious—of postwar media systems as a supplement to the history of the modern and by complex chains of intermediation at work in the production of mass culture during the Cold War era.

Acknowledgements

This program of work been funded by a Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council Doctoral Fellowship and by fellowships awarded by the Province of Alberta and University of Alberta. In addition, Lisa Hall, Ann Gillum, Charles Gillum, and Lloyd and Nancy Saxton all supported the completion of this dissertation, financially or in spirit. Thanks are due to Barbara Holdridge and Marianne Mantell, who kindly allowed me to interview them on several occasions and who gave me permission to quote from their private correspondence. Warm thanks are also due to Harper Collins Publishers, which allowed me access to their working business records early in my research and permitted me to quote Caedmon's album covers. Excerpts from the unpublished letters of James Laughlin (Copyright 2005) are used by permission of the Trustees of the Estate of James Laughlin and of the New Directions Ownership Trust. The unpublished correspondence of Ernest Hemingway (Copyright 2005) is cited with the permission of the Ernest Hemingway Foundation Permission. Permission to quote David Higham's private correspondence has been granted by David Higham Associates.

Thanks are due to my supervisor, Dr. Jo-Ann Wallace, who shaped the methodology of this dissertation as a cultural history. Certainly, the dissertation has become a very different project upon completion than that which I first imagined due to her influence. Dr. Wallace, Dr. O'Driscoll and Dr. Qureshi brought different perspectives to this project, which, due in part to its interdisciplinarity, was a difficult one to complete to everyone's satisfaction—including my own. I am grateful to all of my committee members for their forbearance and for their perseverance in supporting this program of work. I also wish to acknowledge the support of my son, who persistently encouraged me to finish the dissertation and not to give up—despite the high price he paid during for the seven years that I spent completing it.

Table of Contents

Introduction

The Scene of the Postmodern:
A Record Company as an American "Caedmon" 1

Chapter One
A Short History of Sound Recording 41

Chapter Two
Modern Poetry, *Read Texts* and "The LP Moment" 91

Chapter Three
Cold War Cultural Crusade and "The Second Face of 'Modernism'" 144

Chapter Four
Spoken Texts and the Postmodern Shakespeare:
A Return to the Scene of European Modern 200

Chapter Five
"The Two Caedmons at the Controls": Postmodern Sound 253

Conclusion
The Voice of the Poet: Discourse Networks 1900/1950 306

Works Cited 337

Introduction
The Scene of the Postmodern:
A Record Company as an American "Caedmon"

Two young graduates, Barbara Holdridge and Marianne Mantell, founded Caedmon Records in March 1952.[1] Caedmon was the first record company to specialize in recording the spoken word. Throughout the duration of the Caedmon enterprise, the company focused on recording poetry. During its very early years, the company focused on recordings of modern and contemporary poets reading their works aloud. Caedmon's very first LP, *Dylan Thomas Reading A Child's Christmas in Wales and Five Poems,* made Thomas into a pop culture icon and served to lay the financial foundation for the rest of Caedmon enterprise. Shortly afterwards, Holdridge and Mantell began to release recordings of an older generation of modernist poets reading their works aloud, including T.S. Eliot, Marianne Moore, William Carlos Williams, e. e. cummings, Gertrude Stein, Ezra Pound, Wallace Stevens and Edith Sitwell. While none of these records attained the commercial success of the Thomas LP, they sold well enough to sustain Caedmon as a commercial recording enterprise. In the astonished words of the popular press, the Caedmon "girls" had found a way to make poetry "pay."[2]

From humble beginnings, Caedmon became the largest company of its kind in the world. Ten years later, one of its founders would note in the context of justifying low sales of Ezra Pound's spoken word LP, that over one hundred and twenty-five salesmen called on schools and bookstores in the United States alone, and that every school, library, bookstore, and record store in the United States, Canada, England, Australia and South Africa as well as bookstores on the Continent were visited regularly by Caedmon salesmen or salesmen of its licensees.[3] Pound remained a "hard sell" in the early 1960s. Yet given this kind of distribution it is perhaps not surprising that the Caedmon enterprise itself was enormously profitable. In 1970, the record company was sold to Raytheon—a military industrial conglomerate and a Fortune 500 company—for a paper value in excess of four million dollars. Holdridge and Mantell stayed with Caedmon as salaried executives until 1975 under the direction of Raytheon affiliate D.C. Heath.

For most of the period between 1952 and 1970, Caedmon dominated the spoken word industry in the United States and globally. This period was particularly important in the dissemination of modern poetry. During the early and mid 1950s, in particular, Caedmon produced many of the foundational spoken word documents of the American national poetry archive. In the process, the record company introduced a generation of young Americans, and a broad cross-section of adult Americans, to the phenomenon of modern poetry. Within months of its inception, Caedmon had established institutional markets for spoken word recordings that consisted of high schools, colleges, universities and public lending libraries. Caedmon records also found a popular audience of Americans outside the educational system who had recently bought record players and who, according to Caedmon's first sound recording engineer, were willing to try anything recorded in the new LP format. Nor was Caedmon's influence limited to the American context. Individuals and institutions from all over the world ordered Caedmon LPs. International agreements about the circulation of cultural and educational materials, which were initiated by UNESCO in 1947, and later ratified by the cultural component of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (or GATT), meant that such records circulated freely on a global scale. By 1954, Caedmon records were disseminated throughout the Western Hemisphere and beyond—to countries as distant as Jordan and Japan.

Throughout this dissertation, I will argue that a complex series of historical forces "produced" the Caedmon spoken word recording enterprise as a moment of intermedia in which the legacy of modern poetry effectively became the content of postmodern mass media and postmodern mass media systems as part of a larger postwar media shift from a culture of reading to a culture of secondary or technologized listening. However, at the same time Caedmon's contribution to twentieth-century cultural history, and to spoken word publishing more narrowly, was clearly the result of the creativity, intelligence, taste, intuition, charm, determination, versatility, sense of educational mission, entrepreneurial acumen and sheer hard work of two young women who founded a record company on the premise that ordinary people might want to buy recordings of poetry. Even before they hatched the idea of founding a commercial record company devoted to recording the spoken word, Caedmon's twenty-two year old founders were precociously accomplished. Barbara Holdridge (née Cohen) and Marianne Mantell (née Roney) met as under-graduates at New York's Hunter College. At the time they attended it, Hunter was at the forefront of a series of changes that were representative of reforms within the American educational system as a whole. The Class of '50 grads were among the first to major in the new Humanities program as part of the reconsolidating and institutionalization of the Humanities during wartime and in the period immediately after the war. Part way through their A.B. degrees, Hunter also became co-ed in order to accommodate the young men who were then still flooding into the post-secondary educational system under the auspices of the G.I. Bill as a mechanism that extended a liberal arts education to the so-called "common man."

Like many of their generation, and certainly most Humanities majors, Holdridge and Mantell shared in an interest in what Mantell would later define as "the very old and the very modern."[4] The two introduced themselves to each other at the blackboard during a summer course in Ancient Greek. Subsequently, they went on to study Sanskrit and journalism together. The two brought complementary strengths and areas of expertise to the relationship that would become the basis of their professional partnership. Holdridge, who was a native of Manhattan and the daughter of a successful textiles salesman, had previously majored in Art and was a talented student of English Literature. Mantell, who was born in Berlin of parents who were of Jewish Austrian heritage, had attended schools in Paris and London as a refugee before her father settled the family in Queens. She was a professional cantata singer and a graduate of the prestigious New York High School of Music and Art. A multilingual polymath, Mantell had begun college with the intention of majoring in Physics.

Mantell entered a doctoral studies program in Comparative Medieval Literature at Columbia after she graduated. While pursuing her studies full-time, she also worked as a freelance translator in New York's booming classical recording business where she "knocked off translations one after another" of various libretti for almost every classical recording company in New York. During the course of her freelancing work, Mantell was constantly asked for recording ideas. She had previously proposed the idea of recording medieval music to some of the owners of the classical recording labels for whom she worked. She thought that these recordings might be marketed on a small scale to people with her own discriminating tastes and interests, possibly at institutions such as the Museum of Modern Art. As Mantell describes the vision of niche marketing that would later drive Caedmon Records: "I knew the economics of the record business. How much it would cost, not counting talent. Who the record distributors were and how many copies of a new release one could put out there. My argument to my various employers had always been that if your talent costs were under control, you could make a reasonable profit on the sale of 1000 copies. And I was certain that there were 1000 people with my tastes whom these record companies could reach."

Mantell remembers outlining her ideas to one record company owner in particular. Yet Willy Avar of Period Records consistently rejected them. As Mantell recalls: "If it was something serious, he would say the majors would do it. If it wasn't obvious, he would say that it wouldn't sell." Then, according to Mantell: "One day, without any thought, I said, 'Why don't we do poetry?' Or maybe I said, 'Why don't we do Shakespeare?'" On another occasion, she suggested producing recordings of American literature. When Avar responded to all of these ideas by proposing to do a recording of "medieval American poetry," Mantell realized that record company owners simply did not have the cultural background to appreciate her innovative ideas. However, she suspected that at least five percent of Americans did. And she knew that five percent was more than enough to support a commercial record company.

Holdridge was also taking graduate level courses part-time at Columbia, also in the field of Comparative Medieval Literature. However, during the day she worked as an assistant editor at Liveright Corporation where her duties included reading manuscripts, editing books, advising on book jacket design, supervising printing and handling contracts. The publishing firm was not what it had been during the 1920s when Horace Liveright had published many first editions of many modernist masterworks by T. S. Eliot, Ezra Pound, William Faulkner, Ernest Hemingway, e.e. cummings, Katherine Anne Porter and others. Arthur Pell, Liveright's former accountant, then headed the firm. Perhaps because of Horace Liveright's early promotion of the works of Sigmund Freud, Liveright Corporation had evolved into an educational publisher that specialized in psychiatry textbooks. Yet the firm was still imbued with the aura of an earlier era of publishing history and Holdridge often came to the office on her days off, specifically to read correspondence between Liveright and the authors and poets he had published—many of whom Holdridge and Mantell themselves would soon come to know and record.

Both women understood that there was relatively little prospect for advancement in their male-dominated fields. They stayed in touch over a series of weekly lunches at Schrafft's Restaurant largely because of a growing determination to work for themselves in some as yet unspecified cultural enterprise. At one of these weekly lunches, in the third week of January 1952, the two hit upon the idea that became Caedmon. Holdridge mentioned that she had been particularly impressed with Dylan Thomas' poem "In the White Giant's Thigh," which had been recently published in *The Atlantic Monthly.* She noted that the poet was scheduled to read at the Poetry Center at the Young Men's Hebrew Association in a few weeks. Mantell had read the poem, too, and liked it. As she remembers: "We didn't exactly make a decision. It was a top-of-the-head, spur-of-the moment kind of thing. I was in the record business, constantly pushed for workable recording ideas. We had both read that month's *Atlantic* and 'In the White Giant's Thigh.' Barbara said, 'Let go to the Y and hear him.' And I said, 'Let's record him.'"

Thomas himself was then making a living as "a flannel-tongued one night-stander" and "a practicing interpreter of poetry."[5] In effect, Thomas and other BBC lecturers and performers took the BBC *Third Programme* on tour throughout the American hinterland as part of the postwar lecture and poetry reading circuit. Instead of aiming his performances at adult listeners outside the educational system, Thomas targeted a generation of American freshmen, many of who were reading modern poetry for the first time. Thomas' live performances mixed readings of his own verse with his interpretations of the works of others. Interspersed among both were riffs of apparently impromptu standup comedy where the Welsh mimic satirized himself and his audience—often in the form of wicked imitations of the voices of his American hosts. Thomas' performances in university settings were wildly popular. However, it is unlikely that he would have become the legend that he did, nor would he be remembered some fifty years after his death, had not the two women of Caedmon chosen to record him in February of 1952 in the middle of his second tour of America. Neither Holdridge nor Mantell had attended a poetry reading before they attended Thomas' reading yet with the aid Peter Bartók—the son of composer Béla and Mantell's boyfriend at the time—they successfully recorded Thomas a few weeks later.

As an early press release makes clear, Holdridge and Mantell founded a record company based on the premise that Americans who were flocking to hear Thomas and other BBC performers perform live might also want to purchase LP recordings of read and spoken poetry. Holdridge and Mantell were not the first Americans to record Thomas, however. The president of Columbia Records, Goddard Lieberson, had recorded Thomas as part of a companion record to Lloyd Frankenberg's *Pleasure Dome: On Reading Modern Poetry.* Houghton Mifflin had published the printed poetry anthology in 1949. The Columbia companion record, also published that year, included a recording of Thomas reading "Poem in October," along with recordings of T.S. Eliot, Marianne Moore, e.e. cummings, William Carlos Williams, Ogden Nash, W.H. Auden and Elizabeth Bishop—all of whom would subsequently be recorded by Caedmon.[6] However, in the process of recording Thomas, Caedmon took commercial spoken word recording in a direction no one else had envisioned. Essentially, Holdridge and Mantell were the first to imagine that recordings of modern poets and modern prose stylists might enjoy a popular audience.

Educational spoken word records had been around since the turn of the century but most of these involved actors reading poetry. Not-for-profit institutional producers such as Harvard or the National Council of Teachers of English had produced a limited number of recordings of poets reading their works but these had generally been made with a low regard to their overall technical quality. Commercial record companies had made also made few prestige literary records as "cultural window dressing," according to Caedmon's founders, but these had been poorly marketed because established record companies had no sense of what the audience for them might be. In contrast, Holdridge and Mantell clearly understood the cultural and intellectual aspirations of many of their generation. While they aimed to produce records for a new demographic of young

American adults who like themselves had an interest in "the very old and the very modern," they also personified their audience in explicitly gendered terms as "the barefoot GI" who had gone to fight in Europe and who had returned to the United States hungry to understand the culture that he had been exposed to there for the first time.

The importance of the tastes and appetites of the ex-GIs who were then flooding into American universities and colleges as a result of the GI Bill cannot be over-estimated in relation to the Caedmon enterprise. This "barefoot GI" had played a decisive role in the defeat of fascism and the triumphal return of democracy. However, it is less remembered that the ex-GI was also the emblem of particular reading and listening formations that had emerged in wartime—largely as the result of the Office of Wartime Information. The culture that the ex-GI had been exposed to for the first time was not merely the result of his contact with much older European and Asian civilizations—much of it had been produced and distributed by the American Office of War Information or OWI. The ex-GI was the target audience for low-cost paperback editions of modern and literary classics as a reading and publishing formation that had emerged during the war. Equally if not more importantly, the ex-GI as audiophile was also at the center of the postwar "cult of high fidelity." He had developed his distinctive listening habits largely as the result of wartime radio programs.

While the ex-GI was at the center of postwar efforts to extend liberal arts education to the common man, he was also a central figure in the discourse on the relationship between new forms of mass media and mass communication as mass education. The ex-GI was hailed not only as a consumer of the postwar media but even more essentially as the central figure in a broad cultural narrative that reflected the roles that culture and sound technology had played in defeating fascism and winning the war. By consuming both in the postwar period—if not necessarily furthering his formal education—the ex-GI continued the ideological fight against fascism that had begun in the context of his military service. This consumption was part of the social aging of wartime reading and listening formations during the postwar period, and the scene of postwar mass culture, in which Caedmon Records was to play such a major part.

However, all of this lay ahead when Holdridge and Mantell first ventured to the Poetry Center at the 92nd Street Y to hear Dylan Thomas. As Holdridge recalls: "We had no idea what this man sounded like. We went because he had a poem published in *The Atlantic* and it was a great poem and he had some notoriety." Holdridge remembers being "bowled over" by the undulations of Thomas' Welsh voice in performance. As she recalls: "The fact of the voice was a stunner." Clearly, the two had a candidate for recording. Significantly, the two founded and named their enterprise only after hearing Thomas perform. Needing to sign a contract with William Morris in order to secure the poet's services and unable to find financial backers, the fledgling medievalists took a chance and quickly incorporated. They arrived at the Caedmon name on the subway while on the way to an evening class in philosophy at Columbia. As Mantell remembers: "Between 59 Street and 116 Street we went through all the names we could think of, starting with the Greeks, moving up in time through the Romans, until we came to the first poet in native, or Ur-, or Old English."

It was Holdridge who arrived at the Caedmon name. As she recalls: "We went through all the literary names we knew, the Roman and the Greek, and they had all been taken—all the good ones. And then suddenly I switched to Old English and said, 'Old English, Caedmon.' That was it! Caedmon!"[7] According to Holdridge, the beauty of Caedmon was instantly apparent given "that Caedmon was the first English poet and that he had been inspired by an angel." Giggling, she adds, "The fact that he slept with pigs was appealing also!" The haste with which the partners chose Caedmon as their figurehead is typical of the exigencies of launching a business and of the largely unconscious "feel for the game" that according to Pierre Bourdieu characterizes all forms of cultural production, including commercial publishing (137). Yet given that the over-determined Caedmon name tells much about cultural logic of Holdridge and Mantell's enterprise and the fact that myths are central in cultures of orality, including cultures of secondary or technologized orality, I will elaborate upon some of the implications of that choice here—particularly since Holdridge and Mantell appear to have unconsciously invoked a figure that generally marks sites of media and cultural shift as well historically discrete interfaces between orality and literacy.

As students of medieval literature, both women had read excerpts from Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* in the original Latin. It recounted the story of Caedmon, an illiterate seventh century swineherd, who was the first to translate Latin scripture into Old English verse forms. Caedmon acquired his poetic gift from an angel who commanded him in a dream to sing "of the beginning of things." When Caedmon awoke, he recalled the verses he had sung in his dream. He was admitted to a monastery on the basis of his gift of translating scripture while sleeping. Caedmon was instructed in religious scripture by day. Upon waking the following day, he rendered this scripture into the sung vernacular. As Kevin Crossley Holland recounts:

> Caedmon sang of the creation of the world, the origin of the human race, and the whole story of Genesis. He sang of Israel's departure from Egypt, their entry into the land of promise, and many other events of scriptural history. He sang of the Lord's Incarnation, Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension into heaven, the coming of the Holy Spirit, and the teaching of the Apostles. He also made many poems on the terrors of the Last Judgment, the horrible pains of Hell, and the joys of the kingdom of heaven. In addition to these, he composed several others on the blessing and judgments of God, by which he sought to turn his hearers from delight in wickedness, and to inspire them to love and to do good. (148)

The poems attributed this earliest of British bards appear to have been written down at different periods and by more than one scribe. Only the short fragment "Caedmon's Hymn" has been preserved. Therefore, there is some doubt as to the historical veracity of the Caedmon figure. Nonetheless, many, including Chaucer and Milton, considered the humble oral bard to be the father of English poetry.

The Caedmon myth figures a foundational cultural synthesis between Latin Scripture and Anglo-Saxon orality as the basis of a national poetic tradition. The Caedmon legend is clearly an allegory of the historical permeation of Germanic or Anglo-Saxon heroic verse forms by Christian themes and influences. Stripped of its religious elements, Caedmon is also a sign that figured a changing relationship between orality and literacy in a particular historical context. The swineherd's medial position between the divine monks and lowly animals appears to be allegorical in terms the human and the symbolic order. Somewhat heavy-handedly, one might suggest the Caedmon myth may have appealed to Americans at mid-century who wanted to join their English brethren in the aesthetic art of poetry, or word song. Holdridge laughs at what she calls these scholarly interpretations, however. As she notes: "We had a name, and we went with it." Nonetheless, she also concedes: "It was very appropriate. That's why we thought of it."

In choosing the name of Caedmon, Holdridge and Mantell were essentially returning to the founding scene of British poetry—under conditions of secondary or technologized orality. For her part, Mantell suggests that the two partners invoked the Caedmon name primarily for the way that the Latin verb chosen by Bede indeterminately refers to either to speaking or the singing of texts.[8] In the era of full sound spectrum sound recording and reproduction, the singing of texts equated with the sonic stylization of poetry, or the so-called "music" of the spoken poetic word, in the form of complex patterns of prosody that are not stored in print. Postwar full spectrum sound recording and reproduction technologies liberated poetry from what might be termed "typographical regimes." For the first time, audiences—if not necessarily readers—could hear the complex forms of prosody inherent in poetry and in modern poetry in particular.

However, it is important to acknowledge that the historical Caedmon's singing or speaking of Scripture also relates to other historical reading practices. In particular, it evokes the practice of reading the Bible aloud within the Christian tradition and the older Hebrew tradition of canting the Torah (Middleton 278). Framed in this way, reading texts aloud and singing such texts aloud harks back to the performance culture of Ancient Greece—where written works were not "published" unless read aloud—as preserved in the Christian and Hebrew religious traditions. However, while the practice of reading sacred texts aloud for performative purposes has a long history in Western culture, the poetry reading as a primary spoken word performance genre—or as disseminated over the airwaves to secondary or mass audiences—was also important during the Second World War and immediately beforehand when the cultural practice seems to have served in complex function in defending the written word against the Nazi attack on literature, the book and the legacy of print. It was during this period, that poetry—and the cultural practice of reading poetry aloud—became a form of political morality and a supplement to both literature and the spiritual legacy of the "culture of the book," or the shared Judeo-Christian religious tradition.

With reference to the broader history of modern reading formations, it is important to note that the phonetic resonance of the Anglo-Saxon name "Caedmon" invokes the Ancient Greek myth of "Cadmus" or "Kadmos," which was central to the discourse of the humanities in its different historical formations. The figure of Cadmus was a central trope in the history of modern British poetry, based on a culture of classicism, as this dates back to the Renaissance. Cadmus was also at the heart of Anglo-German Hellenism and of the modern or Romantic rewriting of classical culture and classical history throughout the nineteenth century, including reading programs in the classics as the basis of a modern nineteenth century education and of modernism as a parodic counter-formation.

The fuller dimensions of the Ancient Greek myth of Cadmus/Kadmos cannot be unraveled here. However, essentially the legends of Kadmos and Danaos figured cultural hybridity in the form of cultural influences on Ancient Greece from civilizations of the Near East and Africa, including Phoenicia and Egypt. The Phoenician Kadmos was the father of writing, including literature, as the supplement to the Greek oral tradition. The Egyptian Danaos was the father of science, philosophy and religion. (In contrast, the native European influence was figured in the passive and feminine Europa.) As traced by Martin Bernal, the legend of Kadmos figured the Phoenician colonization of Thebes and the consequent adoption of writing or the phonetic or Phoenician alphabet.[9] As such, Kadmos is fundamentally at the scene of European writing.[10] Marshall McLuhan was the first to argue that Kadmos legend, like other oral myths, involved a "succinct statement that described a change that occurred over centuries" (25). One might describe this as a media shift from primary orality to literacy.

The crystallization of literary and philosophical activity that was classical sixth and fifth-century Greece has been figured as both foundation and fall. It was based on a widespread translation of a culture of primary orality into Phoenician or phonetic writing.

Over time, the alphabetic code became the phonocentric means of transmitting the Western tradition through the scribal cultures of the Ancient and medieval worlds and into the era of mechanized print, which began with the mid fifteenth-century invention of the printing press. Alphabetical writing and the mechanical printing press enjoyed what Friedrich Kittler terms a "monopoly" within the Western tradition until the mid nineteenth-century when the development of telegraphy and photography, and later phonography and film, brought about the period of media history that Kittler refers to as the age of differentiated media, or the Age of Edison (1-3). Print enjoyed media dominance, in contrast, until the aftermath of the Second World War. The postwar full spectrum sound and voice media involved the industrialization of the human voice as supplement to primary o/aurality. It also involved the emergence of acoustically technologized discourse as a supplement to the legacy of phonetic writing as the base of so-called Western civilization and to the printing press, in particular, as a language reproduction machine and the defining technology of the modern period.

Fundamentally, in choosing the name Caedmon, Holdridge and Mantell were returning to the founding scene of British poetry. However, they also appear to have been also unconsciously returning to one of the most toxic tropes of modern and modernist discourse on the so-called "origins" of writing—and reworking that sign in postmodern discourse. While Caedmon was founded as an American supplement to the performances of Thomas as a postmodern "Caedmon," Holdridge and Mantell appear to have also unconsciously summoned that legend in order to supplement the works of Ezra Pound as a modernist "anti-Cadmus." Pound had virulently attacked both the spread of Christianity and the impact that the printing press had wrought upon the polyphony of pagan European troubadour poetry. His singing troubadours stood in for a cultural tradition that was displaced by the spread of that religious tradition and by the adoption of the printing press as a medium for disseminating poetry and metered verse in particular as a form of mechanically reproduced "poetic discourse."

Caedmon/Cadmus represented a complex return to a contested site of cultural influence in that Caedmon legend figured not only of the changing interface between orality and literacy but also the spread of the Judeo-Christian tradition in pagan medieval

Europe. Pound's anti-Semitic discourse of the so-called origins of the phonetic alphabet as a writing system and on the polygenetic origins of Ancient Greek culture as the foundation of European civilization more generally was advanced most notably in the *Cantos* and in *Guide to Kulchur*. The fact that Pound repeatedly invoked the figure of Cadmus throughout the *Cantos* is clearly not irrelevant to this larger literary and cultural history. Perhaps befitting Pound's own use of radio as an instrument of secondary orality, Caedmon Records' response to Pound's discourse was also waged in media of secondary orality—or perhaps more accurately media of secondary literacy—that addressed a mass audience that was more familiar with primary orality and media of secondary orality than with the literary tradition *per se*. This was the cultural work of "mass culture" during the postwar period as a political project to contain the threat that had been posed by fascism.

It is also important to note that the Caedmon figurehead was initially deployed in an extremely hip fashion towards a generation of very young Americans in the verbal and material register of kitsch. One of Caedmon's earliest press releases invoked the Caedmon legend in a radically vernacular way, albeit in a certain type of kitschy ad-speak, that best illustrates Caedmon's own "hail" to these early audiences:

> Caedmon, said an interfering angel to our snoring specimen of a seventh century swineherd, "sing me something." This to a dullard who for the want of rhyme had slunk from every sing-fest ever staged in Britain's isles. So Caedmon, under divine pressure, sang; sang, indeed, while snoring; and thus became the first English poet . . . .

This lighthearted rehearsal of the Caedmon legend occludes the essential invocation from the angel to sing of "the beginning of things." What is important is the not the transitive object "the beginning of things" but rather the intransitive injunction to "sing" during a moment of media shift from a culture of reading to a culture of secondary or technologized listening.

Fundamentally, this dissertation approaches the Caedmon enterprise as a moment of publishing history that emerged during the cultural-historical and techno-material "moment" of the LP as a medium of voice and sound storage and voice and sound reproduction. The LP was part of a broader constellation of voice and sound technologies that emerged as part of the postwar "audio revolution." Fundamentally, the postwar audio revolution represented technical divide between partial sound spectrum and full sound spectrum sound recording and playback. It was driven by the LP as a software medium as engineered in magnetic audiotape and played back on high-fidelity sound reproduction systems. That the development of the LP and magnetic audiotape involved a moment in the industrialization of music or of secondary or mass-mediated musical performance cannot be overstated. However, at the same time it also involved a moment in the industrialization of the human speaking voice in media of secondary verbal performance as a supplement to both print and the matrices of primary o/aurality. As a reproduction of a vocal "real," the LP was the first aural object to capture the full harmonics of the human speaking voice; in effect, voice recording and voice reproduction became "life-like" for the first time.

Audiotape was an even more essential element in postwar voice recording because it permitted the editing and engineering of a speech-event. As a result, for the first time both verbal spoken word performance could be manipulated in ways that were equivalent to the typesetting that is involved in print publishing. The audiotape/LP moment was also significant in the history of poetry as a sound-saturated medium in particular because it reintroduced sonic stylization or the music of the human speaking voice into the performance of poetry and the spoken word in general—in effect reversing the silencing operations of the printing press.

The LP and the "audio revolution" were also part of wider postwar media shift that included a similar divide between partial and full color spectrum image reproduction, and a shift from print to media of electronic mass communication. This period of media history—the electronic and analogue postmodern—spanned from the breakdown of the print-mediated public sphere, at the close of the nineteenth-century, to the consolidation of the digitally mediated public sphere at the close of the twentieth. I frame this period of media history as the scene of the American postmodern. It is a supplement to the history of the European modern, as predicated on print as a medium of information storage and transport and of cultural transmission, and on the printing press as a language reproduction machine.

As I define it from a media centered perspective, moments in the consolidation of the modern—including the postwar postmodern—are clearly driven by the modernization of the materialities of mass media and mass communication. The American postmodern was driven by innovations in electronic mass communication and in image and sound reproduction as supplements to the printing press, as initiated by foundational figures such as Eastman, Edison and De Forest. However, only in the postwar period were these technologies used on a wide scale in the dissemination of poetry. The record press emerged as a postmodern supplement to the printing press as a language machine only after Second World War—largely as a result of the efforts of the two young women of Caedmon, who envisioned a record company devoted to recording the spoken word and who secondly imagined poetry as the spoken word "content" of "the LP moment."

With the exception of Pierre Bourdieu, whose theory of cultural production clearly underwrites my investigation into Caedmon's role as a publisher of the spoken word within the broader context of postmodern or post print publishing culture, all of theorists whose work informs this dissertation write in the tradition of media history first elaborated by Marshall McLuhan, whose *Understanding Media* was clearly written as a supplement to Brooks and Warren's *Understanding Poetry*. As such, what is foregrounded in my approach is the larger relationship between poetry and media. Because of poetry's status as a so-called "technology of the self," the material dissemination of poetry necessarily lies at the heart of any shift in media systems (Rasula 275). During a fifteen-year period after the war, but more narrowly a ten-year period that spans the cultural moment of the monaural LP, the textual tradition was effectively translated from the visual modalities of print into the sonic modalities of voice and sound based-media, including media of voice and sound reproduction and media of electronic mass communication. It was during this period that the legacy of print, and the textual tradition more narrowly, became the content of postmodern mass media and postmodern mass media systems.

Even as the postwar moment of media shift involved a technical translation of the entire textual and theatrical traditions as a phenomenon of intermedia—and a return to Shakespeare as the scene of the British modern in particular—it was initially particularly important in the dissemination of the works of the first generation of stylistically innovative modern American poets who had been prominent in the teens and early 1920s. In 1952, the so-called "free verse" movement was effectively half a century old. "Modern poetry" had already been well consecrated and institutionalized. Readers could not read modernist poetry in particular by sight from the printed page, however. In part, this was because its typographical visual dissonance; more importantly, readers could not decode the sonic dissonance of modernist poetry, which often relied on radically stylized "mixed meter" and on different forms of acoustic iconicity.[11] With its dense system of intertextual allusions, modernist poetry was effectively a "closed system." Even more profoundly alienating than the modernist parodying of Hellenic cultural codes was the complexity of modernist metric code.

Through LP recordings, readers were able to access the meaning of the already consecrated monuments of literary modernism—not through their attempts to sound these highly stylized mixed meter works out for themselves but rather through their exposure to poets' own performances of their highly rhythmically stylized works. Holdridge and Mantell would subsequently refer to these recordings as "the third dimension of the printed page." In conjunction with the New Criticism—and in some ways fundamentally in opposition to it, the LP was at the site of the postwar democratization of modernist poetry. However, at the same time Caedmon's spoken word recordings of modern poets were also part of a wider phenomenon that Raymond Williams identified as the second of "the two faces of 'Modernism,'" or modernism as a universally distributed mass culture. While the first face of literary modernism involved small press print culture (and paraliterary modernist performance culture), the second involved the mass mediation of modernism in the print and post print modalities. I reframe this translation as the scene of the postmodern.

With the supplemental exception of Dylan Thomas as the very first poet that Caedmon recorded, the Caedmon venture is the most closely associated with recordings of modern poets reading their own works aloud and particularly with recordings of modernist poetry which had been produced by the foundational "first generation" of modern American poets. This dissertation suggests that the *read texts* that were produced by Caedmon during the 1950s in particular involve a moment of intermedia that was significant moment in the history of poetry in general and in the dissemination of literary modernism in particular. As the earliest and largest commercial publisher of its kind, and one that specialized in recordings of modern poetry, Caedmon played a role in mediating the translation of the modern, and of literary modernism in particular, into the postmodern voice and sound technologies of the postwar era.

I will suggest that the trajectory of literary modernism from what Pierre Bourdieu terms the autonomous or elite field of restricted literary production, where art is produced for an audience of fellow producers, into the large scale or industrial field where art is produced for a mass audience, needs to be considered with reference to the post print media of the postwar era. Although it had other modalities, including visual modalities, the mid-twentieth century American rehearsal of the Western cultural tradition and an articulation of the modern and modernism more narrowly to that tradition during what was in effect a moment of proliferating media systems was heavily conditioned by the translation of printed discourse and the literary or textual tradition more narrowly into post print verbal mass media or voice media. As a publisher of voiced poetry, Caedmon Records played a vital role in the translation of the legacy of modern poetry into postmodern voice media but particularly in relation to the technical translation of literary modernism.

The postwar recuperation of literary modernism has been conceived of in largely print-centric terms that do not allow for the media shift from the visual modalities of print mass culture to the auditory modalities of postwar voice media that this dissertation will soon outline. The recuperation of literary modernism by the New Criticism, the anthology politics of the postwar era, and the large-scale dissemination of modernism in popular print modalities have all received significant critical attention. This dissertation "fast-forwards" past print-centred analyses to suggest that the reconstruction of literary modernism—and the fraught nexus between material modernism/material postmodernism—must be critically reconfigured to allow for a recognition of the impact of post print media and for the emergence of the machine-lathed microgroove record press as a postmodern supplement to the modern printing press. As an educational and popular publisher of commercial spoken word LP recordings of leading modernist poets reading their works aloud, Caedmon must indisputably be at the center of such an investigation.

The larger Caedmon venture had different periods of emphasis, however. Caedmon produced many of the foundational voice documents of the national poetry archive during the first blush of full sound spectrum voice recording in the early 1950s. However, as the 1950s progressed Caedmon began to supplement these recordings made by poets and authors themselves with recordings of actors reading historical literature. During this second phase, Caedmon recorded Vincent Price reading Shelley, James Mason reading Browning, and Louis Jourdan reading Baudelaire, for example. While text and poetry more narrowly were the spoken word "content" of both phases, these spoken word genres were very different in disposition from one another even as both can be posited at the scene of the postmodern for different reasons. Following essential distinctions about sound texts outlined by Arrigo Lora-Totino, I categorize the spoken word documents that Caedmon published during these two different periods as *read texts* and *spoken texts*. According to Lora-Totino, *read texts* involve the author's performance of his or her own written text in a way that involves a high degree of literacy in relation to orality. The written text is primary and the writer's performance is not highly stylized. I use Lora-Totino's term throughout this dissertation to refer to texts read by poets and authors themselves.

In contrast to *read texts*, Lora-Totino maintains that "the versions, graphical and acoustical are of equal value" in *spoken texts* (25). *Spoken texts* generally involve a comparatively higher degree of orality than *read texts*. The sonic element in *spoken texts* also changes what Lora-Totino calls "the disposition of the written text" (25). Lora-Totino uses the term to apply to texts voiced by their authors. Certainly, in the sense that Dylan Thomas performs his own works his performances are often *spoken* rather than *read*, for example. However, I use Lora-Totino's term *spoken text* more narrowly to refer to texts that are voiced by people other than the author and most commonly by actors. This is because the act of voicing, or the disposition of the actor's voice, almost always fundamentally changes the disposition of the written text. As such, these recordings are at the scene of a sonic discursivity, particularly to the degree that they involve the performance of poetry by regimes of secondary orality and non-literary secondary voice cultures such as "radio voice" or "film voice."

The Caedmon catalogue involved what Lora-Totino frames as the most discursive of sound texts, or *read* and *spoken* texts. Lora-Totino's *spoken compositions* and *sonic compositions* involve respectively lesser degrees of literacy and progressively higher degrees of sonic stylization and are not discussed here. *Spoken compositions* generally involve a certain amount of improvisation and the use of non-verbal sounds to supplement the poem's verbal content. (Wallace Stevens, alone of all the poets Caedmon published, practiced a form of *spoken composition.*) *Sonic compositions* involve different types of abstract and non-verbal sound poetry or sound arts. Fundamentally, sound poetry is a form of sonic anti-discursivity. While sound art dates back to Dada as a performance art that was engaged with introduction of electrico-acoustically mediated speech technologies, such as public address systems, in the context of the First World War, sound poetry also consolidated in the postwar period as a response to the emergence to the discursivity of public poetry reading—as well as a wider shift from print to voice media systems or acoustically technologized discourse.

Caedmon turned from the legacy of modern poetry to the legacy of modern drama with the development of stereo. Recordings of Shakespeare in particular became the spoken word content of the "stereo moment." Caedmon's turn to theatrical recordings represented a return to the scene of the European modern—or theatre as the platform of the modern public sphere in the terms outlined by Jurgen Habermas. This turn was part of a wider phenomenon that I frame as the postmodern Shakespeare as the basis of the postwar postmodern public sphere. That moment was also one in the dissemination of poetry in that the turn to Shakespeare represented a return to unrhymed iambic pentameter—or blank verse as a form of public speech or a "national P.A. system"—

in the terms outlined by Marshall McLuhan (196). In 1964, Caedmon turned to large-scale educational recording more narrowly as the fourth phase of its recording enterprise. This turn occurred as the result of large-scale federal funding initiatives that were undertaken under President Johnson's administration to introduce audio and audio-visual media into American classrooms on a large scale. This moment was part of the larger history of post-print mass media as supplements to print. It was effectively the scene of postmodern educational inscription, which had begun earlier in the international context.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, defining the postmodern and locating its historical emergence during the postwar period has become central to the writing of this dissertation. My project to situate Caedmon at the scene of postmodern publishing is informed by Michael North's treatment of Boni & Liveright as the scene of modern American print publishing as structured around that firm's publication of T.S. modernist poetic monument, *The Waste Land*, in 1922. While no single figure or institution can stand for the complexities of the scene of the postmodern as it relates to Cold War mass culture, Eliot and Caedmon Records go a long way. Following this line of thought, one might suggest that T.S. Eliot's *read text* performance of *The Waste Land* on *The Caedmon Treasury of Modern Poets Reading* is effectively a postmodern supplement to the modern print publication of Eliot's poem in 1922. Eliot's *read text* performance might also be seen within a postmodern continuum that includes his radio performances on the BBC and NBC during the 1930s and 1940s, his postwar forays into popular culture including his dramatic verse popular hit play *The Cocktail Party* and his children's book *Ole Possum's Book of Practical Cats,* and his 1953 poetry reading before an audience of 13,000 which filled a Minneapolis football stadium. That continuum also includes Eliot's German language address to Berliners over the airwaves shortly after the Allied occupation of that city, which advocated a European reconciliation around a shared Western cultural heritage, and Eliot's reputed involvement in the Congress of Cultural Freedom as an institution that was central in Cold War cultural politics.

Even as Caedmon effected the translation of the legacy of the modern into postmodern mass media in ways that echoed Liveright's earlier attempt to articulate modern American writing with the tradition of world literature and modern cosmopolitan literature—and to articulate both with popular writing or Americana—there are significant differences between modern print publishing and postmodern print and post print publishing. Fundamentally, the postwar postmodern represented the emergence of post print mass media—including of media of full image and full sound spectrum reproduction and media of electronic mass cultural transmission—as supplements to print. Postmodern or post-print publishing was also fundamentally a post-national or global phenomenon: it was produced and distributed globally in the service of creating a "universal" culture as a supplement to the nationalist excesses associated with late 19th century and early 20th century modernity, and more narrowly to contain the breach that occurred with the rise of fascism as the historical culmination of "modern" discourse. Thirdly, postmodern publishing involved the appropriation of so-called popular mass media—including sense-differentiated media of sound and image reproduction, audiovisual mass media, and media of electronic mass cultural transmission—in the service of mass education. Lastly, although occasioned by the project of containing the historical trauma caused by fascist media systems, postmodern mass culture was also grounded in the political and economic realities of the postwar period. The ideological project of postmodern mass culture was tied to the public rehabilitation of capitalism in the postwar period and to the project of universalizing capitalism and democracy (which was sometimes seen as being self-identical with a program of "Americanization").

To some extent, my media-based definition of the postmodern goes against the grain of conventional understandings of the postmodern particularly with reference to literary production. The term "postmodern" is conventionally ascribed to Charles Olson, who used the term "postmodern man" to refer to Black Mountain poetics in a 1951 letter to Robert Creeley (Hoover xxv); postmodern poetry was also once referred to—by anthologist Donald Allen—as "The New American Poetry." In contrast, a postmodern poetry named as such consolidated in the early 1980s; the definitive literary anthology that marked its emergence might be said to be Donald Allen and George F. Butterick's *The Postmoderns: The New American Poetry Revised* as published by Grove Press in 1982. The postmodern began to be theorized by figures such as Fredric Jameson around the same time, as it had been slightly earlier in the European context by Andreas Huyssen.[12]

Moments in the discourse of the modern including the postmodern have historically tended to consolidate with shifts in the institutionalization of knowledge or discourse, or in moments of technical shift. From a media-centered perspective, discourses on the modern—including the postmodern and postmodernism—have consolidated during periods of shift in the technologization of the word. This occurred during each of the four waves of technical shift that this dissertation outlines in the 1890s, the 1920s, the 1950s and the 1980s. Rather than opposing Olson's formulation of break, rupture and discontinuity between the literary moderns and the literary postmoderns, it seems relevant to broaden the definition of the postmodern to include the concurrent period of cultural and media history in which the legacy of the modern became the content of postmodern media systems, in order to allow for both positive and negative relations between the modern and the postmodern and for moments of continuity and discontinuity between them.

Fundamentally, the American postmodern involved a certain transfer of cultural and communicative capital from the Old World to the New during a postwar moment of media shift. Essentially, then, this dissertation relates Caedmon's publication of the "voice of the poet" as a phenomenon of intermedia to a larger mid-century media shift from print to post print mass media as part of a shift from a literacy to a culture of secondary or technologized listening. Loosely following the insights of Friedrich Kittler, I sketch out a ten-year period of media shift from the visual modalities of print to the auditory modalities of voice and sound mass media and electronic mass communication. In the United States, this shift in information storage and transport and cultural transmission occurred in roughly ten-year period that extended from 1948 to 1957 as new forms of voice and sound technology that had been developed or refined during the war were redeployed in the fields of mass culture, mass communication and mass education. Unlike Kittler, then, I suggest that not one but two media shifts occurred in the twentieth century: the first of these involved a mid-century media shift from print to electronic voice and sound transmission and full sound spectrum and full image spectrum reproduction while the second involved the late twentieth-century "digital revolution." Although it had a visual or image based modality, acoustically technologized postwar mass media was fundamentally characterized by as a shift from a culture of reading to a culture of secondary or technologized orality as a supplement to the print mediated public sphere and the scene of the European modern.

Into the postwar din of a secondary or technologized electronic voice culture, Caedmon introduced the voice of the poet. This voice supplemented written poetry as the content of romantic/modern media systems as tracked by Kittler in *Discourse Networks 1800/1900*; it also supplemented the dissonance of modern/modernist poetry as a typographically-technologized counter-formation to both romantic poetry and modern mass culture as traced by Kittler in *Gramophone, Film, Typewriter*. Fundamentally, the voice of the poet was introduced into the field of mass media and mass communication as part of what might perhaps best be termed the post print or postmodern humanities. Alternatively, the voice of the poet can be seen as a material instantiation of the post-modern or spoken liberal arts. Staying within the Kittlerian paradigm, one might suggest that the postwar postmodern involved a synthesis of historical dialectic between the heterogeneously technologized discourses of modernism and the discourses of humanism. The postmodern humanities can be likened to the digital humanities with the significant difference that they represented the (analogue era) translation of print into secondary voice media, within the broader context of sound-centered mediasphere dominated by the introduction of television, and secondarily of educational FM and international short-wave radio (as postmodern supplements to modern radio), and thirdly by constellation of voice and sound reproduction technologies that constituted the postwar "audio revolution."

Even as I track the Caedmon spoken word recording enterprise in relation to this shift in media systems, I also examine the Caedmon venture more narrowly in relation to a phenomenon that I label after Walter Ong as "the decade of secondary orality" (136). As Ong defined it, secondary orality is based on the use of writing and print as text or script in secondary or technologized mass media contexts; in particular, Ong used the term secondary orality to refer to the voicing of literary texts via electronic media. I radically historicize Ong's concept of secondary orality in order recover the ten-year period of media shift between 1948 and 1957 when the legacy of the modern—and the legacy of the textual tradition and of literature more narrowly—became the spoken word "content" of postmodern mass media. This period corresponds very closely to the monaural LP era as the LP effectively had a monopoly on voice reproduction at this time.

While secondary orality is a useful term to describe the postwar consolidation of a secondary or acoustically technologized voice culture, Caedmon's contribution to this period of media shift might also be termed—perhaps more accurately—as a form of "secondary literacy." My alternative use of the term "secondary literacy" throughout this dissertation allows for the way in which text as the content of postwar mass media and postwar mass cultural transmissions evolved dialectically in response to the fascists' use of radio as an instrument of secondary orality, which effectively stages the opening "scene" of Ong's discussion of the concept in *Orality and Literacy: The Technologization of the Word*, as well as the broader politicization of reading during wartime and during the Cold War period. That politicization underwrote the reading of texts aloud as the content of postmodern mass media and postmodern mass communication during the postwar period and the postwar democratization of the literary tradition.

I also explore the Caedmon publishing enterprise in relation to what I term after Raymond Williams as "the LP moment," by building on Williams' idea that "the moment of any new technology is a moment of choice" (136). Essentially, Williams argues that what I call the disposition of particular forms of mass media and mass communication technologies is not technologically determined but instead involves a reification or fossilization of a field of social struggle that surrounds each medium during the moment of its emergence. For my purposes, "the LP moment" involved the ten-year period after the monaural LP record was introduced as a mass medium of secondary verbal and musical performance. The Caedmon commercial voice publishing enterprise can perhaps be best recognized as a field of possibilities—or "positions" and "position-takings"— within the field of spoken word recording as a particular field of cultural production that emerged only in the "moment" of the LP as a full sound spectrum aural mass commodity. The spoken word content of the LP moment was not technically determined, however. I will suggest that Holdridge and Mantell's positions and position-takings as publishers of the spoken word within the field of LP recording established poetry as the spoken word "content" of the LP moment and permanently influenced the disposition of the LP medium itself.

Throughout this dissertation, I will use seemingly competing theoretical frameworks to describe publishing in different technical modalities or technically differentiated fields of cultural production during the postwar period of proliferating media systems. In particular, Bourdieu's concept of "disposition" is central throughout. Bourdieu appropriated the concept of a theoretically innate psychological temperament, or disposition, to explain the tendencies of individuals to exhibit unconscious class-differentiated behaviors with regard to the production and consumption of symbolic goods (61). As used by Bourdieu, "disposition" also refers to the objective characteristics of particular agents within any given field of cultural production and their largely unconscious choices in the overall game of cultural production. My use of the term "disposition" is also drawn from the field of apparatus criticism and a certain etymological play between the French words *disposition* and *dispositif.* Because any media and media machine is ultimately transformative, disposition reflects "machinic" discourse—or the play between *disposition* in its psychosocial aspect and *dispositif* in its technical or mechanical aspect. In the era of technologically mediated culture, shaping the disposition of any given medium or media machine is what is at stake in any given field of cultural production that emerges during the moment of any new medium.

The techno-material sense in which I am using the term "disposition" is also drawn from Raymond Williams, although the latter does not use this term as such.[13] I use the term "disposition" to refer to the agency involved in attempting to control the social use or applications of any particular medium or media machine. In the hybridized sense that I am using it here, "disposition" refers to the technical properties and secondary performance genres that characterize the moment of any given media machine or medium, and the concept that these involve a materialization or reification of the social struggles to control each during the moment of its emergence. In general, the disposition of a particular medium or media machine appears to evolve as the result of the highly historical struggles between the producers and consumers of such machines. Producers shape the technical capacities of these machines to perform certain operations. They also market these machines by identifying their proposed uses. Advertising campaigns, for example, play a large role in the shaping the early disposition of particular machines and of sound reproduction media. Market conditions, such as how much money people are willing to pay, also determine the social life or the disposition of a particular medium or media machine, as do the vagaries or accidents of early use that are involved in the social application of each. Disposition is largely the product of the internal dynamics between the producers within any given field of media, as well as of competing dynamics between different fields of media within the overall field of media at any given point in time. Although the disposition of any particular medium or media machine can change over time, the moment of its emergence is particularly important because it is at this moment that technical form and secondary performance genres as the content of any mass medium first stabilize.

My use of "disposition" allows for aesthetic, political, ethical and entrepreneurial agency on the part of producers with reference to the development of any particular medium or media machine. However, at the same time I will refer to the "political unconscious" of the LP medium and of postwar media systems more generally. Loosely extending upon the work of Fredric Jameson, I suggest that all forms of media are characterized by a political unconscious that shapes any given field of media—and therefore its disposition as a product of the positions and position-takings within that field—at any given point of time in synchronic terms. Equally importantly, it has a diachronic aspect. The political unconscious of the LP medium, for example, was clearly shaped by its origins in the Office of War Information during wartime. These origins gave the medium a democratic—and democratizing—disposition.[14]

My use of Jameson's term is also drawn indirectly from the work of Bourdieu, who suggests that the positions and position-takings in any given field of cultural production are largely unconscious (137). My use of "the political unconscious" allows for an uneasy resolution of the debate about the *intent* of publishing during the Cold War era, in relation to materialist critiques of print publishing networks and electronic mass communication as advanced by figures such as Frances Stonor Saunders and Raymond Williams. By taking this position, I move beyond the reified legacy of ideology-critique that has come to stand in for materialist approaches to the history of cultural or ideological production during the Cold War era. This perspective seems well warranted given that Caedmon's founders have repeatedly assured me—apparently in good faith—that many of Caedmon's editorial decisions were made largely unconsciously.

My use of "the political unconscious" in relation to postwar media systems is also related to the social aging of wartime media systems and of wartime ideological apparatuses. The concept of "social aging" also originates with Bourdieu, who used the term to refer to the social trajectory of any given cultural or literary movement. According to Bourdieu, these stages include (1) the moment of staging rupture, difference or symbolic revolution, as followed by (2) consecration, (3) academicization, and (4) mass commodification (61). These stages account for both the ideological recuperation and the commercialization of once revolutionary cultural movements. The exemplary case in this respect is undoubtedly modernism as a pan-aesthetic phenomenon. I use the term "social aging" more broadly than Bourdieu to refer to a variety of cultural practices and social institutions. Most notably, I refer to the social aging of wartime reading and listening formations and to the social aging of wartime media systems in various fields of commercial cultural production and in various Cold War ideological apparatuses dedicated to cultural warfare and ideological "containment."

Ultimately, Bourdieu's model cannot fully account for cultural production during the postwar period of proliferating media systems and for institutionalization and mass commodification of modernism in particular during the Cold War era, in part because of a certain "criss-cross" between fields of commercial cultural production—including the print publishing, sound recording, and film industries—and ideologically driven non-commercial cultural production as initiated by various Cold War ideological apparatus that were devoted to cultural or ideological containment. Indeed, while only a single sentence in *The Field of Cultural Production* alludes to the power of the state in the field of cultural production, that power is effectively both overtly and covertly at the scene of the postwar postmodern—not only within America but also globally (125).

In addition to these broad conceptual frameworks, the Caedmon enterprise is secondary orality/literacy more broadly are best understood in relation to the social aging of reading of wartime and the ongoing politicization of reading in the Cold War context. The former is clearly best understood as a dialectical response to the fascist attack on the so-called "origins" of the phonetic alphabet and the fascist attack on print including literature and on culture more generally. The defining moment of that attack involved the burning of thousands of books on the steps of the Reichstag in 1933 shortly after the Nazi Party assumed power. One immediate after-effect of the Nazi rise to power was an attempt to extend a humanistic and a liberal arts education to the so-called "common man" within the United States, which began in the 1930s and intensified during the war.[15] Another was the defense of the book as part of an anti-fascist cultural politics, which was perhaps best exemplified by attempts to expand the public library system within America, in which first Lady Eleanor Roosevelt played a part, and by Archibald MacLeish's efforts as Librarian of Congress, and as a polemicist for the social and political role of the book within a democratic society during this era.[16] While the historical relationship between literacy and democracy was actively renewed during the 1930s and early 1940s, those efforts intensified considerably during wartime.

In particular, the Council of Books in Wartime as an organ of the American publishing industry responded to the fascist ideological threat by overtly weaponizing the book. The Council consolidated around publisher W.W. Norton's effective slogan "Books are Weapons in the War of Ideas" (*A History of the Council of Books During Wartime* 5). In material terms, the Council published 108,500,000 books for American servicemen; 3,600,000 books in overseas editions targeted towards speakers of foreign languages; and over 300 radio programs about books (*A History of the Council of Books During Wartime* 3). While the Council's motivations were clearly ideological, publishers were eager to participate in the project to provide free reading material to enlisted men with the clear understanding that these efforts would create new audiences for books at the end of the war (Fussell 239). Wartime books, which were published in lightweight paperbound "pocketbook" formats, largely for enlisted men, essentially laid the groundwork for the postwar "paperback revolution" as a moment in publishing history and mass education that was so essential to the postwar democratization of literature. In effect, the Council represented a certain supplement to the Modern Library, which had first been commercially marketed to American enlisted men in the First World War by Boni & Liveright (Satterfield 21). This reading material was also explicitly framed as an opportunity for GIs to acquire the basics of a liberal arts education (Fussell 238). The Council published books of every category but was noticeable for its commitment to classics and Modern Library titles (Fussell 238). Poetry anthologies were a key element in wartime reading programs. American and British servicemen went to war armed with no small number of poetry anthologies such as *The Pocketbook of Verse* (Fussell 241).[17]

Public reading, or reading aloud, was also part of this wartime reading formation. Fussell notes that reading aloud was common among enlisted men during wartime in contexts that ranged from tours of active duty to prisoner of war camps (240). Reading aloud assumed therapeutic and almost magical properties during this time, particularly in the British context. Perhaps most emblematically, Fussell notes that Churchill was allegedly nursed back to health after a bout with pneumonia in part because his daughter read aloud to him (229). Beginning in the late 1930s, many British writers read aloud over the airwaves as part of publishing their works to mass audiences who were unlikely to have read them. While this sort of paraliterary programming continues to the present day, it seems likely that this reading program initially involved a dialectical response to the Nazi instrumentalization of radio as a medium of mass communication in the service of "secondary orality."

The wartime poetry reading was also part of this program of public reading. As organized by Osbert and Edith Sitwell in particular, wartime poetry readings assumed political and therapeutic or psychological dimensions that were not invested in poetry reading as a cultural practice during other historical moments, such as the late nineteenth-century and early twentieth-century elocutionary movement or modernist paraliterary performance culture. The wartime poetry reading represented a kind of defense of the arts, not only in relation the material deprivations of life in wartime, in which culture was in relatively short supply, but also as a response to the fascist attack on the book and culture more generally. It was during the war and its immediate aftermath that literature and poetry more narrowly became a form of political morality that supplemented Scripture, or the Word of God, as the content of the Bible.

Effectively, these programs of public reading became the spoken word content of the LP and of the larger decade of secondary orality that emerged during the postwar period. This was part social aging of wartime reading formations—and the political unconscious of postwar media systems. However, at the same time wartime reading programs were also simultaneously supplemented by Cold War reading programs that were very different from the disposition of reading in wartime. Kristen Matthews has outlined these reading programs the most fully. She notes that reading programs and reading guides were part of a larger "Cold War reading crusade" that simultaneously functioned to delimit or constrain America's identity during "a time of shifting social and political structures" and to contain the ideological threat posed by communism (1). America's Cold War reading crusade took the form of reading guides and reading programs such as *The Wonderful World of Books, Books for Adult Beginners* and materials published under the imprint of the Great Books Program and the Book of the Month Club. These Cold War programs targeted immigrants, African Americans and the working classes in the spirit of providing them with the "right" things to read and of teaching them "right" and "wrong" ways of reading as part of a wider anticommunist reading program (5-7). According to Matthews, these reading programs were used to delimit and produce "America" during the Cold War era. However, as phrased by the editors of *The Wonderful World of Books*, this Cold War program had a secondary goal to "show the world that democracy can work and that spiritual integrity does pay" (1). Like the Council of Books in Wartime and other wartime ideological apparatuses, this Cold War reading program had a secondary global audience.

The Cold War reading crusade identified by Matthews was not restricted to the United States. After the war, the reading programs that had been developed as part of the anti-fascist ideological apparatus—and a publicity apparatus for the virtues of democracy and the American way of life—took on a second life as part of America's network of international libraries and cultural centers; the overseas component of the Council Books in Wartime was also incorporated under a variety of organs including foundation-sponsored print publications directed to overseas readers. Many of these books were published in the simple or reduced English that also characterized the Great Books program and other domestic Cold War reading programs. The USIA's "basic" reading programs were also supplemented by various Cold War presses and Cold War periodicals, which under the Congress of Cultural Freedom were devoted to spectacularizing American arts and letters and to politicizing the role of arts and letters more generally within a democratic society.[18] This CIA and foundation-sponsored Cold War publishing formation projected American writing and American arts abroad—in the spirit of containing the appeal of communism among Western European left-leaning intellectuals by spectacularizing the freedom of artists and writers in democratic countries.

The phenomenon that Matthews identifies as America's Cold War reading crusade was only one element of America's larger Cold War cultural crusade—much of which was waged in post print mass media. To some extent, that crusade represented the social aging of the extended Office of Wartime Information's anti-fascist ideological apparatuses, as redeployed in the service of anticommunist ideological containment; this redeployment was exemplified by Dwight Eisenhower's use of mass culture as an instrument of political persuasion in the Cold War era in ways that supplemented President Truman's commitment to "truth" or information as an instrument of America's foreign policy objectives. Indeed, so-called "crusade" discourse clearly originates with the figure of Eisenhower, and from a speech that he had given to American troops over the airwaves on the eve of D-Day, in which he told them that they were about to embark upon a crusade. (Eisenhower's military memoir was also entitled *Crusade in Europe*.) The Eisenhower administration created the United States Information Agency in 1953 as the organ charged with projecting the virtues of democracy, capitalism and the American way of life abroad through the use of various forms of mass media.

Ultimately, "crusade" discourse was a Cold War phenomenon that involved interpenetration between America's cultural industries and its paranational ideological apparatus.[19] Although the film industry as a mass culture industry was most prominently associated with crusade discourse, all of America's cultural industries—including its print publishing and recording industries—were involved to some degree, albeit often on the level of the political unconscious. My point in referring to Cold War cultural crusade—and indirectly to the Cold War Crusade for Cultural Freedom—is not to suggest that Caedmon was a front for the USIA or the CCF. Caedmon was indisputably a commercial cultural enterprise. Rather, I am attempting to gesture to the ways in which all forms of mass media were shadowed by the crusade to project American culture abroad and American civilization more narrowly as part of a broader publicity apparatus. This imperative shaped commercial cultural production within America during the Cold War period—and the political unconscious of postmodern media systems.

However, if America's ideological apparatuses and its cultural industries were "projecting" a cultured version of America abroad in the service of American political and economic hegemony and of anticommunist containment, its print and spoken word publishers were also projecting that vision *within* America—not only in the service of anti-communist containment but even more essentially in the service of combating McCarthyism as a phenomenon that many American liberals saw as a form of neo-fascism. Cold War reading programs and Cold War cultural crusade had not only a productive aspect but also a repressive one. This aspect is best illustrated in the context of McCarthy's probe into America's media systems, including the film industry and the radio and television industries, and his purging of their red—but often merely pink or liberal—elements. That purging included McCarthy's 1953 probe of the American State Department's system of international libraries and its radio organ *The Voice of America*, and the censorship of American libraries and of American paperback publishing which occurred at the same time, which forms the immediate cultural context of the Caedmon spoken word recording enterprise and the wider social history—and social aging—of the Modern Library in the postwar era.

Largely as the result of a 1952 Congressional Report on paperbacks and comics, which instructed special interest groups about how to curtail the distribution of publications they disliked, paperback publishing and libraries were under attack throughout the early 1950s (Robbins 27). While the former phenomenon involved the policing of the racy pulp fiction that had flourished in the 1940s, the legacy of modern writing—with its frequently recurring themes of sex and socialism—was also under assault. The year in which the censorship of reading in America reached its peak was 1953. The most publicized event relating to the latter involved the banning by the Chief of Police of Youngstown, Ohio in February of that year, of one hundred and fifteen unspecified titles including books by D. H. Lawrence, Guy de Maupassant, Somerset Maugham, John O'Hara, John Steinbeck and Sigmund Freud.[20] Only the twenty-five cent paperback editions of these books were banned. All remained available in hardback editions priced between three and four dollars; all remained on library shelves in that city. Paperback publishers of these titles were obliged to go to court in order to defend their right to sell them in Youngstown, however.[21] The city of Cleveland undertook a similar drive to rid local bookstores of paperback titles in 1953.[22] The following year, the city of Utica, New York, was also forced to remove paperback editions of books by Hemingway, Zola and Faulkner from local drugstore shelves—under pressure from an organization called The National Organization for Decent Literature.[23]

Special interest groups were also assailing American public libraries. In San Antonio, Texas, the battle over censorship centered on the drive to stamp certain titles with the "subversive" label; among titles that were described as "subversive" were a number of literary works authored by Thomas Mann and Dorothy Parker.[24] Illinois libraries banned over five hundred book titles involving six to eight thousand volumes, although this ban was removed later in the year. While there were other casualties among American public libraries as the result of this campaign, much of the debate over censorship involved the network of United States Information Service libraries that spanned the globe, which were being probed by Senator McCarthy.[25] As the result of McCarthy's probe, eighteen authors and three hundred titles were initially banned. Eleven books were subsequently burned at two locations in Singapore and Australia.[26] American librarians had already been roused by conditions of censorship within America. However, the burning of books of two USIS libraries mobilized them further because it was widely feared that American libraries would be next. Print censorship and book burning also clearly invoked the historical trauma of the Nazi assault upon the book.

The Freedom to Read movement, which was founded by Librarian of Congress Luther Evans and endorsed by the American Library Association in May of that year, arose as a response to this policing of America's international libraries (Robbins 31). President Eisenhower intervened shortly afterward. Standing on the steps of America's largest undergraduate library at Harvard's Dartmouth College, Eisenhower denounced "book burners" and "thought control" as being antithetical to democracy.[27] Arguably, Eisenhower's speech was one of the defining moments of political rhetoric during his first term as President; it is credited with curbing some of McCarthy's appeal to conservative Americans. Ironically, Eisenhower subsequently upheld the right of USIS to censor books intended for overseas libraries: foundational authors such as Emerson, Hawthorne, James, Twain and Thoreau would be cleared one-by-one in the months ahead. However, *within* America librarians won the day. Ironically, in their constitutionally authorized aspect of "free speech," publishing and reading were reaffirmed as being constitutive of democratic freedoms. This right would be highly propagandized throughout the Cold War.

This assault on the legacy of modern writing and modern publishing set the stage for many different commercial publishing enterprises of the early 1950s. While "mass modernism" had a political contingency of value when deployed globally, it was also a part of the liberal mobilization against the continued threat of fascism *within* America. At this historically specific juncture, American publishers did not merely project a vision of a liberal America abroad: they also did so within America itself. This was the cultural work of publishing in the McCarthy era. While Caedmon was founded with a recording of Dylan Thomas, the company catalogue quickly reconsolidated around the legacy of the Modern Library. The record company was part of a constellation of publishers including Random House, New Directions and Anchor Books that continued to publish Modern Library titles and Modern Library writers. Caedmon alone among these published "the voice of the poet" as a supplement to his or her written text within the context of a broader shift in postwar media systems.

Recovering this period of cultural history and of postwar media shift, in which Caedmon Records played so central a part, is the work of this dissertation. Ultimately, my arguments are perhaps rather modest ones. I will suggest here that the Caedmon catalogue was one of the mechanisms that produced the postwar postmodern, in that it played a key role in the collapse of the high culture/low culture divide that was characteristic of postwar material "mass culture." Even as the Caedmon catalogue served to articulate American civilization and Western civilization, modern American writing and cosmopolitan modern world literature, and modern American literature and popular American writing—much like the Modern Library itself—Caedmon as a paraliterary publisher of *read* and *spoken texts* on LP also served to articulate print publishing industry with the film and radio industries and with Cold War ideological apparatuses such as the USIA or the CCF. This interpolation of different media cultures and different media systems was essentially the scene of the postwar postmodern.

Secondly, I suggest that Caedmon served to produce a secondary or mass-mediated voice culture that supplemented not only to the print-mediated public sphere and the scene of modern publishing but also modern sound and the commercial disposition of American radio, television, and film voice. This postmodern voice culture also supplemented BBC English and codes of Shakespearean spoken word performance as forms of "public speech" that originated in the British context of secondary or technologized orality and primary or non-technologized orality. This, too, was the work of a record company as an American "Caedmon"—and of poetry as the content of postmodern media systems.

The Caedmon history cannot be narrated in any totalizing way for a number of reasons, however. These include differences between how Caedmon's two founders characterize the Caedmon enterprise, and some discrepancies between the information that they have provided me in interviews and accounts of the Caedmon enterprise that have been published elsewhere, including in published correspondence and biographies of figures that Caedmon recorded. The political complexity of publishing in the Cold War era has been difficult to definitively characterize without reference to abstract or theoretical models of cultural and ideological production. Disciplinarity with reference to my object has been an ongoing difficulty—particularly since Caedmon is effectively a paraliterary enterprise. As a result of these difficulties, I have chosen to practice an interdisciplinary *bricolage* that draws extensively on primary documents in the service of producing a cultural history of Caedmon but which at the same time leaves room for an evaluative or interpretive element that is also necessary in the practice of cultural studies. All historical discourse is ultimately representation. Fundamentally, I work within a technomaterialist framework that examines the Caedmon enterprise within the context of a broader postwar media shift that I posit as the consolidation of the American postmodern.

I have also chosen to frame the Caedmon spoken recording enterprise from different disciplinary and methodological perspectives in each of my five chapters. The gaps, fissures, and discontinuities between these mirror my postmodern subject to some extent. In my first chapter, I outline the technical basis for my argument about postwar media shift specifically in relation to the history of sound recording from its origins to the postwar "audio revolution." This chapter historicizes the emergence of the postmodern mediasphere—or the electronic and analogue postmodern—as a supplement to the print-mediated public sphere from the perspective of media history. I historicize the four "waves" of technical innovation in analogue media of reproduction in the 1890s, 1920s, 1950s and 1980s with a view to establishing a framework for a consideration of the differences between "modern sound" and "postmodern sound" as the product of the second and third waves of sound recording in the 1920s and 1950s respectively. More narrowly, I historicize the overall history of sound recording and reproduction in relation the history of mass media before turning to the period of media history I term "the LP moment" as part of the broader constellation of software and hardware innovations that drove the postwar "audio revolution" and "the cult of high fidelity."

In my second chapter, I chronicle the first five years of the Caedmon enterprise as a period in which most of the foundational voice documents of the Caedmon spoken word recording enterprise were first published. I focus on Caedmon's successful recording sessions with figures such T.S. Eliot, William Faulkner, Marianne Moore, e. e. cummings, William Carlos Williams and Edith Sitwell, among others. I also chronicle its unsuccessful attempts to record figures such as Ezra Pound and Ernest Hemingway. This chapter is effectively a kind of literary history. I also describe the distinctive Caedmon business culture as it relates to spoken word publishing as a supplement to print publishing. This chapter concludes with the production of the foundational *The Caedmon Treasury of Modern Poets Reading* as a monument of the first five years of Caedmon' voice publishing enterprise but also a voice document that anthologized the larger spoken word *read text* poetry archive of the monaural LP era.

My third chapter complicates the "second face of Modernism" in relation to *read text* voice recordings that were published in the post-*Treasury* moment. This chapter effectively offers a materialist history of the "second face of modernism." It unravels some of the complex chains of intermediation in play between the fields of Cold War commercial publishing and Cold War ideological apparatuses through its close reading of the material publication history of recordings of James Joyce, Ezra Pound, Carl Sandburg, Jean Cocteau and Ernest Hemingway. This chapter is grounded by a summary of the critical discourse on the relationship between the modern avant-gardes and (post)modern mass culture as advanced by Clement Greenberg, Dwight Macdonald, Kenneth Rexroth, Andreas Huyssen and Raymond Williams. However, I close by recovering the ways in which Dylan Thomas' parodic voice-practice served to sow the seeds of a vocal counter-culture as a supplement to the mass-mediated "second face of modernism."

In my fourth chapter, I turn to the *spoken text* recordings of actors reading historical poetry and the theatrical Shakespearean records that formed the content of the "stereo moment" as the second and third phases of the Caedmon enterprise. Key in this respect is the wider social history of the postmodern Shakespeare and the struggle between Caedmon, as an entrepreneurial institution, and its British competitor Argo, which was supported by the British Arts Council as an ideological state apparatus, to control the legacy of Shakespeare, which was also part of the cultural politics of the Cold War era. This chapter also focuses on Caedmon's turn to educational recordings and details the series of events that led up to the sale of the company to Raytheon in 1970. These include the large-scale acquisition of America's independent or autonomous publishing houses and its independent record companies by industrial conglomerates—if not yet multinationals—as part of a larger "sea change" in the structure of American capital as this relates to cultural production.

In my fifth and final chapter, I turn to sound-centered criticism in order advance an analysis of Caedmon's sound production values as a supplement to authorial spoken word performance. In particular, I focus on the differences between modern and postmodern sound. I also draw on the apparatus criticism elaborated in the context of film studies in order to recover the "listening subject" hailed by these postmodern sound production values. In this chapter, then, I examine the ideological and aesthetic characteristics of postmodern sound from the perspective of sound studies and media studies. However, I also examine the functions of Caedmon's publisher's *peritext* in the form of album covers and liner notes. I examine how Caedmon discursively framed the importance of each poet to that poet's secondary or mass audience. I also examine the visual art on Caedmon's album covers as produced by some of New York's finest graphic designers—including a young Andy Warhol.

In my conclusion, I turn to the larger discursive institutional framework that mediated the consumption of spoken word literary recordings. In this section, I draw on reviews of spoken word recordings by American educators and librarians, as well as early commentary about sound recordings generated by UNESCO publications, which essentially grounded the emergence of postwar mass culture—including the Caedmon spoken word recording enterprise. I close by examining the ways in which postmodernist performance art as this emerged in the mid 1970s explicitly distanced itself from postwar mass-mediated "author cult" and "art cult," or postwar mass culture.

Some of my readers may feel that I have neglected the poetry published by Caedmon during this period. The sixth and final chapter that was projected to be part of this dissertation was to take as its subject an analysis of each poet's voice practice as a supplement to his or her text practice, as preserved in the foundational "first edition" voice documents published by Caedmon. In that chapter, I had hoped to elaborate a sound-centred acoustical poetics. Such a project is long overdue, particularly with reference to the voice practice of sound-centred poets such as Wallace Stevens. The place of linguistically heterogeneous Thomas in articulating both new forms of public speech and articulating a spoken word counter-culture should not be ignored. An aesthetic and political analysis of Thomas' voice practice would be richly rewarding and is also long overdue. However, as an analysis of voice documents of the Caedmon archive might be envisioned as an entire doctoral project, my consideration of that rich legacy must unfortunately await publication in another venue.

NOTES

[1] The material upon which I have based my history of Caedmon comes from both primary and secondary sources. It is upon a series of interviews that I have undertaken with Holdridge and Mantell and one interview with Caedmon's sound engineer Peter Bartók. The court documents that were part Caedmon's 1975 suit against Raytheon, which were provided to me by Barbara Holdridge, have been another primary source. A third primary source has been the business records of Caedmon Records, which are not archived but which are part of the active business files of the Harper Audio section of Harper Collins. Harper Collins generously granted me access to these, which are a source of much of the correspondence that I cite here in particular.

[2] Markel, Helen. "The Girls Who Made Poetry Pay," *Woman's Day*, May 1960, p. 46.

[3] Marianne Mantell, unpublished letter to Herbert P. Gleason, July 5, 1962.

[4] Holdridge, et al. v. Raytheon Company, et al. 75/5066 LPG, U.S. Dis. Ct., S.D. New York, Disposition of Marianne Mantell, p. 62.

[5] Dylan Thomas, "A Few Words of a Kind," *Dylan Thomas Reading, Vol. 3,* LP, Caedmon, 1956.

[6] Both Holdridge and Mantell claim to have been unaware of the Columbia spoken word LP. Frankly, this seems unlikely given that Mantell had worked for Columbia and Holdridge worked for Liveright Corporation, which owned the rights to the cummings' poem used in the print and the audible anthologies.

[7] Some of the names they rejected were Dorian, Apollo, Orphic, Strophe, Canto, Saturn, Lydian and Iliad Records.

[8] Marianne Mantell, "Life and Times: Fifty Years of Caedmon Records," *Toronto International Writers' Festival*, Harbourfront Centre, Toronto, Nov. 6, 2002.

[9] For an extensive treatment of this topic, see Bernal's *Black Athena: The Afro-Asiatic Roots of Classical Civilization.*

[10] Ovid also inscribed Kadmos as the father of poetry through his marriage with Harmonia (Fischer 17).

[11] After Annie Finch, I read most modernist poetry as a form of mixed meter that negotiated a middle position between metered verse and free verse as this emerged in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In addition to modernist mixed meter, many forms of modernist acoustic iconicity seem to invoke the "private" visual and sonic symbolism of the *symbolistes*; as such, this acoustic dissonance is part of the larger retreat of modern poetry from the realm of public language as this begins in the mid nineteenth century.

[12] As Paul Hoover notes of Jameson's series of formulations, postmodernism was characterized by a break in nineteenth-century romanticism and early twentieth-century modernism (xxvi). It involved key features such as "aesthetic populism," "the deconstruction of expression," "the waning of affect," "the end of the bourgeois ego" and "the imitation of dead styles" or pastiche (as cited in Hoover xxvi). Fundamentally, postmodernism was said to be an "expression of late capitalist culture as dominated by multinational corporations" (Jameson as cited in Hoover xxvi.)

[13] For an elaboration of Williams' concept of the social determinants of technical form, see "Culture and Technology" in *The Politics of Modernism.*

[14] Jameson's term "the political unconscious" clearly relates the concept of "disposition" in the sense of a "machinic" discourse as developed by Deleuze and Guattari to refer to the ways in which any literary work is in some sense a machine "producing certain effects, [and] amenable to a certain use" (as cited in Jameson 22). In my use of "the political unconscious," the machinic nature of any material medium such as the LP is as important if not more important than the so-called "content" of that medium. Effectively, then, I move beyond a textual hermeneutics of literary narrative towards a material hermeneutics the political

---

unconscious involved in the production or more accurately the reproduction of literary texts as the content of postmodern media systems.

[15] Books which detail that discursive and institutional response the most effectively include Mark Van Doren's *Liberal Education* (1943); Norman Foerster's *The Humanities After the War* (1944) and *The Humanities and the Common Man: The Democratic Role of the State Universities* (1946); and Arnold Didier Graeffe's *Creative Education in the Humanities* (1951).

[16] For a published record of some of many MacLeish's appeals to American booksellers and librarians, see his 1942 addresses to the American Booksellers Association "A Free Man's Books" and "The Power of the Book," and his 1942 address to the American Library Association "The Country of the Mind Must Also Attack." The latter two addresses included in *A Time to Act.* The former address was published in pamphlet form and bound by the American Booksellers Association. Other instances of MacLeish's periodical addresses to Americans during a slightly earlier period on similar topics include "Of the Librarian's Profession," "Libraries in the Contemporary Crisis," and "The Librarian and the Democratic Process," all of which are collected in *A Time to Speak.*

[17] Of the American wartime anthologists, Random House/Modern Library publisher Bennett Cerf exercised considerable authority as a tastemaker along with more middlebrow anthologists such as Henry Canby of *The Saturday Review of Literature* and the Book of the Month Club's Clifton Fadiman (Fussell 245). The contents of one of the most influential anthologies *American Harvest: Twenty Years of Creative Writing in the United States,* which was edited by Allen Tate and John Peale Bishop, mixed poetry and prose and included works by Ernest Hemingway, Sherwood Anderson, Robert Penn Warren, Conrad Aiken, T.S. Eliot, Marianne Moore, Robert Frost, Wallace Stevens, R.P. Blackmur, Hart Crane and William Carlos Williams (Fussell 245). With a few exceptions, this list of writers corresponds fairly closely with that of the Caedmon catalogue and with that of other educational publishers of the spoken word in the postwar era. The social aging of these anthologies was part of the social life of modern poetry throughout the second half of the twentieth century. The multi disc *Spoken Arts Treasury of American Poetry*—which was published by Caedmon rival Arthur Luce Klein beginning in the early 1970s—would later explicitly pay homage to this wartime anthology with the iconic harvest imagery that graced its album covers.

[18] For a treatment of the Congress of Cultural Freedom, see Frances Stonor Saunders, *The Cultural Cold War: The CIA and the World of Arts and Letters.* New York: The New Press, 1999.

[19] Perhaps that best expression of that interpentration was the broader mobilization of the film industry in the service of the so-called Crusade for Freedom as led by General Lucius Clay in which many prominent American film actors such as Ronald Reagan were involved. The Biblical epics undertaken by Hollywood at the same time seem to have been made at least partially in the service of projecting the idea that Americans were a spiritual people abroad and were another expression of this "crusade."

[20] "In and Out of Books," *The New York Times*, February 23, 1953, p. VII/8.

[21] One of these was Holdridge's former employer Arthur Pell, who was one of the publishers of Sigmund Freud's *Introduction to Psychoanalysis*.

[22] "Cleveland Shops Drop Freud Book," *The New York Times*, 7 Mar. 1953: 17.

[23] "Books Banned in Utica," *The New York Times*, 14 Oct. 1954: 81.

[24] "Branding of Books Stirs Texas Battle, " *The New York Times*, June 7, p. 61.

[25] Hearings led by the Senator into the USIS system of libraries and The State Department's radio organ *The Voice of America* would culminate with several suicides and the formation of the USIA later in the year as an Eisenhower era supplement to the Truman-era international ideological apparatus.

[26] "Some Books Literally Burned After Inquiry, Dulles Reports," *The New York Times*, June 16, 1953, p. 1.

[27] "'Book Burners are Assailed by President at Dartmouth," *The New York Times*, June 15, 1953, p. 1.

Chapter One
A Short History of Sound Recording

The history of sound recording begins Thomas Edison's invention of the first generation phonograph in 1877. However, sound recording is part of the broader history of sense-differentiated media of image and sound reproduction, which spans the breakdown of what Friedrich Kittler terms "the alphabetic monopoly," or the use of print as a medium of information transport and storage and of cultural transmission, at the close of the nineteenth century, and the emergence of the digital era at the end of the twentieth century (4). The era of post print mass media includes sense-differentiated media of image reproduction and media of sound reproduction, and audiovisual media. It is closely related to the era of electronic mass communication. The history of sound recording more narrowly can be separated into the era of partial sound spectrum recording and reproduction, which extended from 1877 to 1947, and the era of full sound spectrum recording and reproduction, which began in 1948. A divide between partial and full color spectrum image reproduction closely paralleled the divide between partial and full spectrum sound recording. The technical shift from print to post print analogue and electronic media is essentially the scene of the postmodern.

This chapter will suggest that the era of analogue post print mass media, including sense-streamed media of image and sound reproduction and audiovisual mass media, was characterized by four waves of technical innovation that occurred in the 1890s, the 1920s, the 1950s and the 1980s. Each period was characterized by developments not only in sense-streamed sound reproduction but also in image reproduction and in technologies of mass communication. In this chapter, I focus largely on periods of technical innovation in sound recording and sound reproduction technologies. I will suggest that the analogue era of sound recording and sound reproduction can be separated into four forms of playback that were dominant during each of these waves of technical innovation: these include the acoustical era gramophone disc, the electrical era gramophone disc, the LP and the audiocassette.

This chapter outlines three of these four waves of technical innovation. In this chapter, I reframe the dialectic between print, as the engine of European modernity, and of mass-mediated images and sounds and electronic mass communication as supplements to the print-mediated public sphere and the scene of the American postmodern. I do so largely through my treatment of the history of sound recording and sound reproduction as the sonic stream of analogue mass media. The history that I offer here provides the broader techno-material context behind the decade of secondary orality as a phenomenon of media shift. Essentially, I track a shift in language reproduction machines from a culture of the printing press to a culture of the record press as a shift in the technical and sensory modalities of the published word. This shift grounded the emergence of a record company as an American "Caedmon."

The spoken word recording archive is a relatively restricted one until the postwar era. In this chapter, then, I focus on the *musical* performance genres—in the form of opera, jazz and classical music recordings—that formed the "content" of each moment of sound recording during the first, second and third waves of sound reproduction technology.[1] I then turn to the small body of spoken word documents that constituted the pre-history of the Caedmon enterprise. I also review the very different dispositions of each wave of technical innovation before outlining what was at stake with Caedmon's publication of poetry as the spoken word "content" of "the LP moment" as part of the broader scene of postwar mass culture.

In order to understand the history of sound recording it is necessary to understand the materiality of sound. The *Encyclopedia Britannica* defines sound as "mechanical vibrations traveling through the air or some other medium at a frequency to which the human ear is sensitive" (556). Rick Altman approaches the definition of sound from a slightly different perspective. He suggests that three elements are required for the *production* of any sound:

> First there must be *vibration,* such as that of the vocal cords or a violin string. Second, the vibration must take place in a *medium* whose molecules can be set in motion, such as air, water, or a railroad rail (sound cannot be transmitted through a vacuum). Third, the transmitting medium must absorb and transmit the original vibrations *in the form of changes in pressure.* (17)

The production of sound involves a physical vibration that creates a series of fluctuations in pressure that are communicated through a medium of some kind. The other half of what Altman and others refer to as "a sound event" involves *reception* in the form sensory perception or aural cognition. As Altman notes: "At the other end of sound's path, the human ear collects that pressure and transforms its mechanical energy into electrical impulses that the brain understands as sound"(20). The ear is not the only part of the body that experiences sound; sound waves also register as physical sensations on the bones, teeth, and skin. However, the inner ear is the primary processor of *sound as sign*.

As a processor of auditory signals, the human ear is sensitive to three different dimensions of sound: *frequency, amplitude* and *timbre*. Waves carrying high-pitched sounds travel at a faster rate of frequency than those carrying low-pitched sounds. The human ear is sensitive to sounds that vibrate at a rate of frequency between 20 to 20,000 cycles per second, or sounds that range from 20 Hertz to 20 MegaHertz. The second material dimension of sound is *amplitude*. The amplitude of sound waves is typically measured in decibels with a zero decibel value representing absolute silence. *Timbre* is the third material aspect of sound: all natural sounds involve a complex series of sound waves each of which is characterized by interplay between a *fundamental* tone or frequency and a series of *partial* tones or frequencies. These partials can significantly impact on the perception of a particular sound. According to Altman, "if the oboe, trumpet, flute and cello sound so recognizably different" when producing the same note, it "is primarily because they produce radically different combinations of partials" (20). Musical instruments produce notes with different *timbres* as a combination of different patterns of *fundamentals* and *partials*. The *timbre* of the human voice is the product of similar harmonic patterns.

Whether it involves musical or spoken sounds, sound recording involves the attempt to store—and to reproduce—the *amplitude*, *frequency* and *harmonics* of sound waves in a range that is equivalent to that of human hearing. However, the history of sound recording and sound reproduction was also influenced by sound amplification, sound transmission, and sound broadcasting as part of the wider history of technologically mediated voice and sound. The history of some of these secondary voice and sound technologies, such as that of telephony as the wired transmission of speech, and of radiophony as the electromagnetic transmission of sound waves, has had a significant impact on the history of sound recording and sound reproduction.

During the first wave of sound reproduction, in the 1890s, sound recording was influenced by developments in telephony in particular. Electrically transmitted speech in the form of telephony actually preceded the mechanical reproduction of speech and music. The electrical transmission of sound over distance was much simpler to achieve than the storage and reproduction of sound waves. Telephony involved the comparatively easy task of exploiting the innate properties of steel wire as an electrically conductive medium that conveyed information as a series of electrically pulsed messages. Telephony evolved from wired telegraphy as the wired transmission of alphabetical or Morse code; as electrical wire was adapted to carry more than a single frequency, telephony became possible. In contrast, sound reproduction presupposed a *medium* of storing sound waves. It also presupposed a mechanical method of *writing* or inscribing sound waves in this medium as well as a method of mechanically *reading* or reproducing them.

The history of sound recording doesn't begin with the technical translation of the mechanical vibrations of sound waves into electrical signals; it is discontinuous with the early history of electro-acoustically-mediated speech. Instead, the pre-history and early history of sound recording and sound reproduction was part of the larger history of mechanical devices. Thomas L. Hankins and Robert J. Silverman have explored the origins of early forms of speaking machines in Europe back to the so-called speaking statues of Ancient Greece. According to Hankins and Silverman, the era of modern speaking machines began with attempts to simulate human physiology in mechanical automata and the subsequent production of a series of functional speaking machines in the years between 1770 and 1790. Eighteenth and early nineteenth-century physiological simulacra were extremely primitive, however. Among other elements, they often involved a mechanical bellows that mimicked the actions of lungs and a reed that mimicked the actions of the vocal cords and larynx.

Attempts to record and reproduce sound were advanced only in the era of nineteenth-century acoustical science as the physical properties and behavior of sound waves became known. Robert Willis, a professor of applied mechanics at Cambridge, was the first to theorize pitch and to construct a pipe organ that could imitate the frequencies of vowel sounds (200-202). Many others contributed to the evolution of early acoustical science including Hermann von Helmholtz, who revised Willis' theory of pitch or *frequency* and also discovered the principles of *harmonics* or *timbre* (203-4). Following von Helmholtz' theories, the British engineers William H. Preece and Augustus Stroh invented a mechanical device that simulated vowel sounds in 1879. The German instrument maker Rudolph Konig also produced a wave siren that mechanically simulated the human voice at roughly the same time (205-8). These machines did not simulate the human body *per se*. Instead, they simulated the vocal sounds produced by the human body by mechanical means.

These late nineteenth-century machines were outdated from the moment they were first constructed given two contemporaneous developments on the other side of the Atlantic. Alexander Graham Bell invented the telephone in 1876. Bell's machine was the first to electrically transmit speech over long distances for the purposes of interpersonal communication as a supplement to primary orality and print-mediated interpersonal communication. Thomas Edison invented the phonograph in late December of the following year. The phonograph was the first machine to inscribe or write the human voice in a medium of sound storage. Unlike Bell's machine, it relied on mechanical acoustics rather than the electrical mediation or translation of sound waves.

A theoretical paper about the principles of sound recording and sound reproduction predated Edison's invention of the phonograph by several months, however. Charles Cros, a French *Symboliste* poet and amateur scientist, wrote that paper.[2] Cros possessed various gifts of the imagination. He also published a study on the theory of color photography, for example (Gronow and Saunio 3). However, unlike Edison and Bell, Cros was not a businessman. The impoverished bohemian deposited his paper at the French *Academie des Sciences* in April of 1877 but was unable to raise the funds to secure a patent (Gellat 23). While Edison was legendary for the way that he kept up with theoretical advances in physical science that were published in Europe, the principles of the machine that Cros described correspond much more closely to the machine that was later invented by Emile Berliner than that produced at Edison's laboratory, which was also invented in the immediate context of intense rivalry between Edison and Bell to commercialize the various technical components that were involved in telephony.

Edison was the first to intuit the answer to the difficult problem of storing sound waves. In previous experiments with telephone transmitters that converted electrically mediated speech back into waves of mechanical energy, he had noted the force of the sound waves emanating from the telephone's diaphragm. As Andre Millard observes, the inventor then "wondered if a needle attached to the center of a diaphragm could be powered by sound to make a mark" (24). According to Millard:

> One night in July 1877, his staff rigged up an indenting stylus connected to a diaphragm, which in turn was attached to a telephone paper that was run underneath the stylus. As Edison shouted into the speaker, a strip of paraffin-coated paper was run underneath the stylus. An examination of the strip showed the irregular marks made by the sound waves. When the strip was pulled back under the stylus, the group of men crowded around the laboratory table heard, with disbelief, the faint sounds of Edison's shouts of a few minutes previous. (24)

Edison had discovered a means of mechanically writing or recording sound waves and of mechanically reading or reproducing them. These basic principles of sound storage and sound reproduction would dominate sound recording for the next seventy years.

Roland Gelatt describes the mechanical principles of the first generation phonograph as follows:

> The instrument that Edison designed consisted basically of a metal cylinder (with a fine spiral groove impressed in its surface) and two diaphragm and needle units—one to be used for recording, the other for reproduction. The cylinder was mounted on screws, so that turning a handle would make it both revolve and move from left to right. A piece of tin foil was to be wrapped around the cylinder, and theron the recording needle, following the spiral groove, would indent a pattern of the sound vibrations direction into the mouthpiece. The stylus would move vertically creating a so-called "hill and dale" pattern in the trough of the

> groove. On replaying, the reproducing needle was to convert these indentations onto the tin foil back into sound. (20-1).

The quality of this first-generation phonograph was so poor that auditors required training in order to recognize the sounds that the machine produced, however.

Edison's competitor, the British engineer William Preece, had been conscripted to sell the phonograph in Europe and even he described the quality of sounds that the first generation machine emitted as follows:

> The instrument has not quite reached that perfection when the tones of a Patti can be faithfully repeated; in fact to some extent it is a burlesque or parody of the human voice . . . There are some consonants that are wanting altogether. The *s* sound at the beginning and the end of a word is entirely lost, although it is heard slightly in the middle of a word. The *d* and *t* are exactly the same; and the same in *m* and *n*. Hence, it is extremely difficult to read what is said upon the instrument; if a person is put out of the room and you speak into it, you can with difficulty translate what it says. (As cited in Gelatt 31)

In effect, Preece was describing the limitations of the phonograph with regard to its capacity to store the differing *frequencies*, speeds or pitches of sound waves. Preece was also describing the deficiencies of the early machine with regard to the *amplitude* or intensity of sound waves. (At this stage, the limited capacity of the machine to record and reproduce the sound spectrum made the question of complex *harmonics* or *timbre* entirely irrelevant.) The first generation phonograph was clearly not a "talking machine."

Despite the technical deficiencies of his machine, Edison foresaw a plethora of possible applications and founded the Edison Speaking Phonograph Co. in 1878. In an article for the *North American Review,* the inventor outlined the ways in which his new invention might possibly benefit mankind. These included talking books for the blind, the teaching of elocution and the reproduction of music. Edison also envisioned educational uses for the machine, its use in the context of office communication, and its archival use for the preservation of particular languages (Gelatt 29). However, the technical capacities of the first-generation phonograph were not initially adequate to any of these proposed uses and Edison's manufacturing plant produced very few of them.

Once he had secured a patent, Edison lost interest in his machine. He became distracted by the commercial potential of the light bulb, which he invented a few months later.

Edison's competitors at Bell Laboratories continued to pursue the task of recording and reproducing sound waves, however. In 1881, Charles Tainter and Chichester Bell produced a new sound recording and sound reproduction device at Bell's Boston research laboratory. The Tainter Bell machine was patented in 1886. It used a superior recording medium of stearin soap, zinc and iron oxide, which was coated over a cardboard cylinder. This medium permitted closer grooving, which resulted in more recorded words per minute. The graphophone used a floating stylus to inscribe and read sound. Instead of inscribing sound vertically in the hill and dale method, the motor-driven graphophone inscribed sound laterally. The wax-like medium employed by Bell and Tainter had some deficiencies in its capacity to store the amplitude of sound waves. Auditors needed to attach ear-tubes in order to amplify the intensity of the recording. However, it was vastly superior in its capacity to store the range of sound-wave frequencies and to reproduce sound (Gelatt 35-37). Edison responded by radically re-tooling the phonograph. Most notably, he switched from tin foil to wax cylinders as a medium of sound recording, which could be used over and over again to record. Edison's second-generation phonograph was also battery-powered. Rather than capitalize his new invention himself, Edison retained manufacturing rights but sold the patent (Read and Welch 40).

The history of sound recording begins for all intents and purposes with the technical dialectic and commercial competition between the graphophone and the much-improved second-generation phonograph. This history cannot be understood merely in terms of a series of technical innovations and technical properties. Instead, it was shaped by the business culture surrounding the marketing of each new talking machine and the broad conditions of its social use. The phonograph's disposition was determined by several factors. One these was the technical dialectic between phonography and telephony. More important was the way that the phonograph was initially marketed as a business machine, not by Edison himself but by a combine called the North American Phonograph Company. That combine was headed by a businessman from Pittsburgh named Jesse J. Lippincott and consisted of a network of local subsidiaries that sold both forms of machines. Lippincott initially envisioned largely business applications for the sound recording machines; he also determined that more money could be made from renting phonographs than from selling them outright. Both of these decisions were to have profound impact on the disposition of the phonograph (Gelatt 42).

In 1890, Lippincott lost control of the North American Phonograph Company and Edison resumed selling his phonographs outright. However, even after Edison regained control of the phonograph, the machines did not sell well in the economically depressed 1890s. Few could afford to buy one for home use at one hundred and fifty to two hundred dollars. Given the monopoly conditions first created by Lippincott and general high cost of phonograph machines, the market responded by adapting phonographs and graphophones for use in public places. People paid to have records made of them speaking at public fairs, for example. Café and saloon owners also installed the machine in their premises and charged patrons for the right to play it. The market, then, changed the disposition of the phonograph by appropriating it for use as a medium of mass entertainment in public venues in ways that were not initially envisioned by Edison himself.

Edison responded to this market by inventing the nickel-play phonograph. Like the dime movie of the thirties, the nickel-play phonograph was ideally suited to the economic climate of the times. (Its use in such settings actually predated the use of film as a mass medium.) Its use—in American saloons and French cafés in particular—gained in popularity throughout the early 1890s. The nickel-play phonograph also spurred the development of a sound recording industry, both as part of the extended Edison enterprise and through the network of subsidiaries that had been set up as a combine by Lippincott. The subsidiaries that were the most economically successful, such as the New York Phonograph Company or the Columbia Phonograph Company, which was located in Washington and which had made a fortune on the sale of graphophones as a business machine to the federal government, produced the lion's share of recordings (Gellatt 48).

The disposition of the phonograph as conceived by Edison was not originally that of an instrument of mass entertainment, however. As a result, the phonograph roll was not suited to conditions of mass production. Musical records were made by arranging ten phonographs in a circle around a group of performers. The performers then repeated themselves over and over again until the required numbers of recordings were produced (Gelatt 47). Because of the lower amplitude that singers produced, vocal records were made even more laboriously at the rate of three at a time. (A pantographic reproduction process was subsequently developed for the purposes of making mass-produced copies but these copies were not of comparable quality to the original.) Just as Edison initially failed to see the potential of cinema as a mass medium, he did not envision pre-recorded phonograph records as mass commodities. Instead, the phonograph was initially conceived of as a recording and playback device with both business and private recording applications.

The phonograph also mimicked other forms of media including sense-streamed amateur photography as a visual medium. Phonograph recordings of loved ones were initially imagined much like photographs and played a ritual role in preserving visual and vocal images of the dead, for example; indeed, they were initially imagined as aural photographs. In contrast, technically superior graphophone recordings augmented the role of photographs as technologies of knowledge, particularly within the discipline of ethnography where they were used to capture the voices of so-called "primitive" peoples, to preserve disappearing languages, to document folk culture, and for the purposes of creating ethnological sound recording archives. These non-mass applications were part of the social life of sound recording throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth-centuries.

In contrast, the disposition of gramophone was remarkably different right from the outset in that the gramophone's inventor, the German-American immigrant Emile Berliner, clearly envisioned the use of the gramophone purely for the purposes of mass entertainment. The major difference between the Berliner and Edison machines involved the medium of sound storage, the method of inscribing sound, and the fact that the gramophone did not record sound. The mechanical principles of the gramophone were very different than those of the phonograph. Gelatt describes those principles as follows:

> Berliner's first steps were to carry out in practice what Charles Cros had suggested in theory. He covered a disc of heavy plate glass with lampblack, set it revolving on a turntable in contact with a stylus, and

> mounted the stylus on a feed screw so that it would create a spiral pattern on the disc. When actuated by sound waves, the stylus vibrated laterally and left a visual tracing on the lamp-blacked disc. Berliner "fixed" this delicate tracing with varnish and had the record photoengraved in metal. As Cros had predicted, when this photoengraved record was played back through a stylus-and-diaphragm reproducer, the original sounds were re-created. (60)

Berliner invented the gramophone in 1887 but did not begin to manufacture the machines on a mass scale until late in 1895. This was because he needed to develop a playback medium for the gramophone machine.[3]

By producing a working model of Cros' concept, Berliner was able to patent the gramophone machine. Although Berliner modeled his machine on Cros' vision, he significantly adapted Cros' projected machine in ways that would shape the disposition of gramophone—or more accurately that of the gramophone disc—as a mass medium. The first step of this process included changing the medium and nature of recording process itself in ways that allowed for a more durable form of master that could withstand the electroplating required to mass-produce copies. The second involved inventing a method duplicating sound recordings in a new playback medium in order to reproduce them on a mass basis. Berliner solved the first problem, that of finding a durable new recording medium, relatively quickly by introducing a chemical component into the sound recording process. As Gelatt observes:

> In his original patent specifications, Berliner had mentioned the possibility of engraving a gramophone record by chemical action; he turned toward the realization of this idea in the winter of 1887-8. Berliner proposed to coat a zinc disc with some workable substance, inscribe a recording on that surface, and then immense the disc in an acid bath; the acid, he reasoned, would eat away the metal where the recording stylus had made its tracings, leaving a thin shallow groove of even depth etched into the zinc. It took several months of experimentation to find a suitable coating. Lamp-black would not do; for, though it registered the delicate vibrations of the stylus, it did not resist the acid solution. At length, Berliner

> developed a method of coating the zinc disc with a thin fatty film that responded to the stylus and yet was impervious to acid. (61)

Although the use of a metal recording disc initially resulted in a lower sound quality, this innovation was important because it enabled the mass duplication of gramophone discs.

The next problem that Berliner turned his attention to was that of mass production. Gelatt describes how Berliner approached this as follows:

> When Berliner spoke at the Franklin Institute of making as many copies of a gramophone record as desired, he had in mind metal duplicates manufactured by the cumbersome process of electrotyping. Indeed, one of the discs he had demonstrated at Philadelphia was a copper duplicate made in this fashion. But soon thereafter he conceived of a far more feasible way of producing duplicates. It involved making a reverse metal matrix from the original acid-etched recording, and then using this "negative" matrix to stamp "positive" records in some suitable material, very much as a metal seal stamps an impression into molten sealing wax. (63-4)

Although it would later undergo the addition of a few extra steps, the basic process of electroplating an original master in order to make a negative record matrix and mass-produced duplicates would prevail throughout the twentieth century. Oliver Read and Walter L. Welch describe this process in more detail:

> . . . . he [Berliner] developed a more practical method of duplicating recordings [than the pantographic method] by electroplating and stamping—this made mass production possible. His original record was plated with copper and nickel; when separated, it made a negative with its grooves projecting as ridges. After hardening, it was used to stamp out duplicate records. Among the materials used by Berliner were celluloid and hard rubber. Many records of "ebonite," a solid hard rubber compound were also sold. These records were noisy and the impressions in the ebonite were distorted by gas bubbles and other imperfections. The life of these records was limited, and after two or three plays, the records were practically useless. (425)

The problem of finding a durable and yet flexible molten substance was not solved before mass production of records began. One of Berliner's associates discovered the shellac based composite substance that would be used to produce gramophone records. A button manufacturer had invented this substance—known as Durinoid—the major component of which was shellac. As a moldable natural occurring thermoplastic or meltable resin, shellac proved ideal in taking impressions from a metal record matrix.[4]

Once Berliner was ready to commercialize the gramophone, he incorporated the Berliner Gramophone Company and quickly contracted out various aspects of the gramophone operation. The sales and promotion of gramophones were awarded to the New York based National Gramophone Company. In contrast, a Camden New Jersey-based machinery manufacturer named Eldridge Johnson took over the task of producing the gramophone machines. Johnson would be responsible for many of the mechanical innovations that allowed the gramophone to become the dominant sound machine including a spring-driven motor that dispensed with the need for heavy and expensive batteries. However, through a series of complicated legal maneuverings, Berliner lost control of the Berliner Gramophone Company in the United States largely as the result of losing several key decisions of the validity of his American patents. Within a few years, the National Gramophone Company, which had built the gramophone business into a million-dollar industry, merged with Berliner's competitors in the phonograph/ graphophone industry, including the influential Columbia Phonograph Company, which owned some of the patents under consideration. Effectively, a process of patent pooling then occurred between Columbia, the National Gramophone Co. and various other interests. Berliner kept the rights to the name of his machine alone but it effectively became illegal for the Berliner Gramophone Company to sell gramophones within the United States after 1899. Gramophones would continue to be produced by other companies. However, from this time forward they were marketed as phonographs (Gelatt 83-99).

The gramophone manufacturer Johnson also deserted Berliner for pragmatic purposes although he remained affiliated with the Gramophone Company. In 1900, Johnson incorporated his own gramophone and record manufacturing company under the name of the Victor Talking Machine Company. After his split from Berliner, Johnson reintroduced wax recording and developed a process of converting wax blanks into metal stampers, which Berliner himself had not done because of patent restrictions. As a result, the gramophone master shared the superior sound quality of a wax recording although shellac, the playback medium, did not. Gramophone records also enjoyed the considerable advantage of being able to be mass-produced. This particular innovation is widely credited with the gramophone's finally capturing market share from the phonograph in the United States around 1902. However, the rest of the world, with the singular exception of France, was already gramophone territory.[5]

Once Berliner had invented the basic principles of the gramophone, he had turned towards producing a catalogue of recordings for the gramophone machine to play. Berliner also began a campaign of aggressive internationalization. The very first Gramophone Co. subsidiary was established in London in May of 1898. The following year, Berliner set up his first record pressing plant in Hanover, Germany, which became *Deutsche Gramophon*. Berliner's campaign to promote the gramophone globally was achieved largely though the offices of Fred and William Gaisberg, two brothers from Philadelphia who traveled all over the world, and most notably throughout Asia and Eastern Europe, setting up Gramophone Company subsidiaries. Another Gramophone Company envoy, Fritz Hemp, developed markets in North Africa and began recording in Cairo and Alexandria (Malm 351). Although Berliner lost the U.S. markets to his American associates, he effectively retained control over the network of global subsidiaries put into place by his envoys.

Each of the subsidiaries established by the Gaisbergs and others sold gramophone machines and generated sound-ware for local markets of gramophone owners. By 1900, the Gramophone Co. catalogue listed over five thousand recordings. These included separate lists for recordings made in English, Scotch, Welsh, Irish, French, Italian, Spanish, Viennese, Hungarian, Russian, Persian, Hindi, Sikh, Arabic and Hebrew (Gelatt 110). Despite the local disposition of gramophone recordings, the Victor-Gramophone network enjoyed a near global domination of the sound recording and sound hardware market. This monopoly ultimately had an impact on the disposition of sound recording as a whole as internationally distributed mass-produced sound recordings became more economically profitable than the local recording projects originally put into place by the Gaisbergs and others.[6]

In contradiction to historians of international film distribution, one might suggest that the first global mass media phenomenon was not in fact the silent film but rather gramophone disc recordings. The first post print mass symbolic commodities to be distributed on a global scale were undoubtedly the Red Label opera recordings produced by the Gramophone Company and the Red Seal recordings produced by Victor as its American affiliate. The penetration of primary or local culture by mass mediated culture began with this phenomenon, which started in 1902. The Red Label series and the Red Seal series were also the first to be associated with what Pierre Bourdieu calls distinction. While opera was a vibrant international performance tradition, opera singing became part of the dialectic of distinction largely for technical reasons. In the early 1900s, the human voice could not be recorded and reproduced with a very high degree of fidelity. There were significant constraints in the era of acoustic sound recording with regard to the *amplitude* that any given performer could bodily generate and project into the recording horn. Because of a high degree of intensity or amplitude, operatic voices projected in the gramophone disc medium better than those trained in other singing traditions. Not all voices trained in the operatic tradition projected into the gramophone disc medium equally well; the *timbre* or complex *harmonics* of particular voices, such as Caruso's, were much more phonogenic than others.

The recording and reproducing of the full range of musical instrumentation was also challenged by the technical limitations of the early gramophone medium and particularly by its deficiencies regarding the reproduction of the full range of sound frequencies. Because of the limited range of frequencies that could be recorded, instrumental sound recording was initially limited mainly to brass instruments. Woodwinds, strings, and percussive instruments were recorded only later. These limitations reflected the recording of orchestral music in particular. Orchestral music relies on a wide range of sound frequencies and on the harmonic interplay of different instruments with different frequency ranges. The frequency range of orchestral music corresponds very closely with the range of human hearing: both extend from 20 *cps* to 20,000 *cps* or cycles per second. The first recordings of orchestral music were made only in 1909 and using a limited range or orchestration (Gelatt 178). Vocal and musical recordings of the acoustical era, then, were clearly shaped by technical factors as to what could be recorded.

The history of sound recording in the United States more narrowly was shaped by the dialectic between the phonograph and the gramophone as competing sound reproduction machines that played back software with very different dispositions. America alone enjoyed a period of competition between two sound reproduction machines and two different forms of sound reproduction media. In the American context, the consumption of gramophone recordings was largely characterized by a dialectic of distinction: "good" recordings came from Europe and were mediated in the gramophone disc format, largely through Victor but secondarily through Columbia. In contrast, pre-recorded phonograph recordings were relatively devalued as symbolic mass commodities. Technically superior to the gramophone in the recording and reproduction of sound, Edison's phonograph lost ground to Victor and Columbia as the two big gramophone interests after the patent pools of 1902. The gramophone enjoyed widespread popularity because of its low cost and the wide range of recordings that could be played on the machine. This dominance quickly accelerated with the introduction of the *Victrola* in 1906. Owning a *Victrola*, a luxury item that cost two hundred dollars, was a statement of distinction.

Edison responded by continually improving the phonograph. In an attempt to secure the high-end market, he converted to the Diamond Disc system, which was based on a sapphire stylus and a more durable and relatively long-playing record. However, the system did not sell because the existing hardware used to play Edison's cylinders could not be used to play his discs. While Edison's late model Diamond disc phonographs were not used widely in home settings, their superior sound quality led to them being adopted for use in dance halls. Much of Edison's contribution to the field of sound recording and sound reproduction after 1900 concerned the disposition of the recordings that he produced as sound-ware for his low-end and high-end late era phonographs.

The disposition of the phonograph was reflected very clearly in the post-1900 Edison catalogue, particularly as it related to the low-end phonograph market. As Gelatt notes:

> Already [by 1903] a distinction had been drawn between the disc public and the cylinder public: discs were meant for the Main Street parlor, cylinders for the shack on the other side of the tracks. (159)

Those "other side of the tracks" markets included the "cracker barrel trade" in rural areas and small towns, particularly in the South (164). They also included strong markets for what was known as "coon music" according to Gelatt, and, slightly later, for syncopated music or ragtime as a precursor to jazz (160). Clearly, there can be no revisionist redemption of the popularity of the first of these genres or the so-called "coon music" of the late 1890s as a genre that was based on the wider tradition of American minstrelsy.[7] The rise in popularity of ragtime as another culturally hybridized genre, which was also performed in the main by white Americans such as Edison recording star and Russian immigrant Sophie B. Tucker, was also linked to the Edison catalogue. However, by the end of the acoustical era, African Americans were also recorded on small record labels such as Black Swan and Okeh. Taken in their aggregate, the first ragtime, blues and jazz records were part of the last hurrah of acoustical era recording.

The dissemination of jazz as a sound recording genre has frequently been equated with the turn to electrical sound recording. However, the first recording to be released as jazz—of the Original Dixieland Jass Band—was released by Victor in 1917 (Gelatt 195). The emergence of jazz on record, then, was not immediately contemporaneous with the electrification of sound recording; rather, electrical era jazz recordings represented a technical translation of acoustical era jazz records as the so-called "content" of the new medium. Before 1926, almost all jazz records, including those made by performers such as Louis Armstrong, Bessie Smith and Jelly Roll Morton were in fact recorded acoustically. Independent record companies at the margins of recording industry produced most of these. Jazz was effectively the content of this "independent" field of cultural production.

The production of jazz records was not mediated by technology but rather by a fundamental decision regarding lateral disc recording patents. This change in the field of production occurred in the seminal years of 1921 and 1922 and involved Judge Learned Hand's public domain ruling to abolish the patent pooling monopoly regarding lateral sound recording, which effectively cleared the way for independent record producers, many of whom had been producing records illegally.[8] Subsequently appealed by Victor, this decision was upheld on appeal by Learned's cousin Augustus Hand (Read and Welch 173). In fact, it is through the Hands' rulings of 1921 and 1922 regarding lateral disc recording (and jazz and blues as the "content" of that field of independent cultural production) that minorities first gained access to the cultural reproduction machine.

Gradually through these sound recording genres America's musical culture became culturally hybridized—first through the Edison line of phonograph records but more importantly on late acoustical era independent gramophone disc recordings.

Sound recording also became more culturally heterogeneous during the First World War when imports from Europe were interrupted. America's population played a role in the changing disposition of the acoustic era gramophone recording during this era. As Millard notes:

> As the number and variety of immigrants grew, so too did the number of special ethnic sections of the catalogues of the record companies. Beginning with Irish, Scotch, and German music, the ethnic sections soon included songs for Spanish and French listeners. The pattern of immigration to the United States changed at the turn of the century, and this was reflected in record catalogues. By the 1880s, the majority of immigrants came from southern and eastern Europe. Greek, Polish, Hebrew, and Russian sections were therefore added to catalogues. By the time of World War I, record companies offered ethnic records for nearly every nationality of the American melting pot, including Oriental and far eastern selections. (88-9)

Sound recording, then, was culturally heterogeneous in a way that other forms of media were not.

Minorities first gained access to the cultural reproduction machine through sound media of the late acoustical era. This access is part of the history of dynamics within the field of mass media as a whole—and the breakdown of the "monopoly" of print as a medium of language reproduction. This access affected the inter-medial dynamics within the field of media as a whole throughout the 1920s, as well as the dialectic between text and music or word and sound in both poetry and song. Rather than framing modernism as a pan-aesthetic cultural formation that negotiated between what Malcolm Bull—in the context of his discussion of visual modernism—has called "the two cultures of capital," or a culture of classicism based on aesthetic representation and a culture of postmodernism or kitsch based on media of reproduction— it is important to recover this liminal space in the field of sound recording in relation to poetry as a sound-saturated verbal medium (98-99). Given the competitive dynamics within the overall field of media, that moment in cultural and media history relates to the so-called "ragging" of classical literary meters in particular as a phenomenon acoustic iconicity or mimicry and of intermedia (North 144-147). The dynamics within the entire field of media were affected as a result—as represented most notably in T.S. Eliot's *The Waste Land.* Effectively, modernist literature and mass-mediated late acoustical era "jazz" became expressions of the dialectic between competing media systems with very different dispositions.

The second half of the 1920s involved a very different moment and disposition of sound recording. That moment involved the emergence of modern electro-acoustically mediated sound that displaced mechanical acoustical-era recording. Sound recording was very different during the second wave of electrical era recording because different techno-material processes produced it. In general, the second wave of sound reproduction was underwritten by the "global" introduction of the microphone, amplifier and loudspeaker into the sound recording and sound reproduction process as technologies that effectively translated sound waves into an electrical stream of information. These principles were completely different from acoustical recording. These electrical technologies were introduced into the radio, sound recording and film industries on a "global" scale during a historically specific period between 1920 and 1927. Radio was the first of these second wave technologies. The use of radio as a medium of mass communication began on an experimental basis in the United States in 1920. The next innovation involved the electrification of sound recording and sound reproduction, which began in 1925. The third development was talking films. The very first full-length talkie with spoken dialogue—*The Jazz Singer*—was released in 1927. All three of these innovations involved the penetration of the visual regime of symbolic forms—based largely in the verbal mass medium of print—by the auditory modality of electrically mediated voice and sound media. These series of innovations formed the techno-material basis of the so-called "roaring twenties" as a shift in the materialities of mass media.

The electronic medium of radio was the first and most important of these second wave technologies. Radio is based on the harnessing of waves of electro-magnetic energy that travel through space for the purposes of transmitting information. The medium is effectively at the scene of post print or postmodern mass communication; indeed McLuhan's formulation of the post-Gutenberg Galaxy was originally the Marconi Galaxy. Guglielmo Marconi first achieved radio transmission in Bologna in 1894. However, two-way interpersonal radio communication was originally a rather primitive affair based on crystal radio sets and wireless telegraphy or Morse code. Voice transmissions began only in 1907 after Lee De Forest invented the Audion tube as a medium that enabled electronic transmission (Fischer 41). The commercialization of radio as a medium of one-way mass communication became possible as the result of a series of improvements in long-distance vacuum tube enhanced wireless telephony. As Steve Schoenherr details, these were made by AT&T during the First World War and led to the development of vacuum-tube loudspeakers and condenser microphones. After the war, radio was commercialized as an electronic medium of one-way mass communication.[9] At that time, radios were battery powered and required ear tubes to amplify reception. However, the success of radio as a mass medium was greatly enhanced in 1924 when the first vacuum tube enhanced radiosets came on the home market. As radio audiences expanded, they began to demand electro-acoustically mediated speech and sound in other contexts including live performance venues, as noted by Emily Thompson, but also in the field of sound recording.

The introduction of electronic radiosets instantly antiquated acoustic era gramophone recordings (Gelatt 218). Engineers at Western Electric, a Bell Telephone company, developed the first system of electrical sound recording in 1924. A 1926 paper published by Joseph P. Maxfield and Henry C. Harrison, the engineers who designed the new electrical system, detailed its major components as consisting of a condenser transmitter, a high quality vacuum-tube amplifier and a magnetic recorder (Read and

Welch 249). David Morton describes the process of the Western Electric engineers as follows:

> Instead of having performers shout into a recording horn and using sound energy to record directly, the electrical recording process converted sound into electricity in a microphone. The signal from the microphone was amplified electronically and then fed to an electromagnetic record "cutter" to pro-duce a recording on a wax-coated disk. The disks could be manufactured in the usual way, and even played on existing equipment (although with reduced effectiveness). (27)

Electrical recording had been theoretically possible since the late nineteenth century but as Gelatt notes: "Without the condenser microphone and vacuum-tube amplifier as adjuncts, its potentialities could not be recognized" (219).

Electrical sound recording was clearly shaped by the dispositions of telephony and radiophony as competing technologies of voice and sound transmission, from which many of its technical innovations derived. As Millard notes:

> The system of electrical recording developed by Maxfield and Harrison exploited their knowledge of sound transmission to develop electrical analogies to the mechanical system of hearing. Their system used a condenser microphone to pick up the sound and change it into varying electric currents, an improvement on the way that the telephone mouthpiece turned speech into electricity. A vacuum tube amplifier increased the strength of these currents and used them to drive an electromechanical recording cutter that made a groove in the record. The cutter was balanced to move precisely within a magnetic field, and as the varying currents from the amplifier influenced its movement, it transcribed their wave forms into the disc. On playback, the movement of the needle in the groove acted within the magnetic field of the electrical pickup to reproduce the varying currents that carried the sound signal. These currents were in turn amplified by vacuum tubes to drive a loudspeaker. (141)

Although other components were important, the primary component of the Western Electric system involved the introduction into the sound recording process of the new condenser microphone.

However, while sound recording was electrified with comparative ease, sound reproduction was plagued by problems of distortion. Loudspeakers and amplifiers were an essential part of the playback system as these reconstituted electrical signals waves of physical energy. However, these were not required in telephony had not yet been perfected even with reference to radio. The very first forms of electrical playback hardware were introduced in 1925. As Millard notes:

> The exterior of the talking machine might not have changed much, but inside was an amplifying unit, with its vacuum tubes, and other electrical devices. The mysterious innards of the talking machine had been transformed from polished brass and oiled gear wheels to wires and glowing bulbs. (144)

What had been achieved was a shift from the mechanical production of sound to the electronic reproduction of sound. As Millard notes: "The electronic amplification of music carried out by the radio's vacuum tubes brought a new sound to American ears—a booming, brilliant sound that could fill up a room" (139). Both Victor and Columbia began the process of converting to an electrical recording process in 1925.

The electrification of sound recording immediately resulted in a much more powerful sound. *Amplitude* was no longer an issue as this could be controlled both in the recording process and the playback or reproduction process. More importantly, the range of *frequencies* that could be recorded increased by two and half octaves; the first generation of electrical era discs stored everything in the 100 to 5,000 cycles per second range, which was an enormous improvement over the late acoustical era 1923 standard of 168 to 2,000 *cps*. By 1929, the recording industry had reached a standard of 50 to 6,000 *cps*. By 1934, ten years after electrical recording was introduced, it could record everything between the 30 to 8,000 *cps* range—a standard of sound recording that first earned the "high fidelity" label (Gelatt 270). For the first time, the electrical sound recording process became sensitive to a range of sound frequencies that approximated the human voice; sibilant sounds, such as the sounds at the beginning of the words "she" and "church," were recorded for the first time although the high-frequency unvoiced phoneme [s] would continue to resist recording or more accurately reproduction in shellac as the playback medium. Although still limited in terms of its range of frequencies, sound recording also began to approach the full range of musical orchestration.

At the same time, the shift to electrical recording dramatically altered the recording of a sound-event. The microphone changed the nature of vocal and musical performance and gratified the desire of the masses to bring things closer humanly and spatially in Walter Benjamin's terms. The introduction of the microphone also changed the relationships between any given group of performers, fore-grounding one performer and back grounding another. Finally, the introduction of the microphone changed the relationship of aural figure to aural ground. The high signal-to-noise ratio that it introduced effectively damped down the contextual elements that shape any sound-event, including the physical characteristics of the performance space and sounds produced by the audience. Perhaps even more importantly, for the first time elements of particular performances were electrically manipulated or engineered and certain aesthetic values were superimposed on the recording process.

The sound recording aesthetic of the late 1920s would be dominated by attempts to manipulate sound recording in order to produce highly artificial effects as part of the fetishizing of the new "modern" sound. Read and Welch summarize what was at stake in the shift from acoustic era to electrical era recording as follows:

> Instead of the old idea of "storing up" sound, or of re-creating it, [after 1924] the capturing of sound was to be considered as a synthesis, the projection of it as an illusion. It is true that illusion is inherent in the methods of the motion picture, dependent as they are upon the psychological phenomenon of the retention of vision. Nothing in the methods essential to the reproduction of sound waves are of that nature. Even so, the old idea of preserving, or storing up of the human voice or musical performance for repetition at will now gave way to the creation of calculated effects, or a specious and spurious type of reproduction. (238)

J.P. Maxfield, the Western Electric engineer who had spearheaded the effort to record sound electrically, would later regret the "romanticism" that electrification had introduced into the gramophone medium. Maxfield explicitly recognized in his own later writings that "he and his collaborators had in some sense created a Frankenstein monster" (Read and Welch 238).

The disposition of second wave modern electro-acoustically-mediated sound recording was shaped not only by technical factors but also by the material conditions in which sound recordings were made. While the introduction of electrical recording in 1925 initially represented a boom to the recording industry, the industry also began to be dominated by productions of radio—and later sound film—as competing mass culture industries. This dramatically changed the disposition of sound recording. Various corporate mergers exacerbated this process. The earliest and most important of these involved the RCA-Victor merger of 1926; related mergers included the Warner Brothers/Brunswick Radio merger, the Consolidated Film/American Record Company merger and the CBS/Columbia merger. As a result of these, the American popular sound recording industry began to be dominated by performing artists from the competing film and radio industries and to take on a very different disposition than it had in the era of acoustical recording. The Tin Pan Alley song later became the dominant form of popular sound-ware in the thirties: it was a product of the tinny highly artificial sound aesthetic of the era; it was also the product of a sound recording industry dominated by radio and film capital.

In effect, the commercial disposition of American radio as it developed during the 1920s had an effect on the formation of a secondary or technologically mediated national voice culture—particularly since radio was the first of the "second wave" of voice and sound technologies. This commercial disposition was determined by several factors. One of these was the fact that the American government did not favor the statist broadcasting model. Instead, radio was allowed to develop along purely commercial lines, largely because the U.S. Department of Commerce oversaw its development. Rather than establishing a nationalized broadcasting system, the American government facilitated the founding of Radio Corporation of America in 1919—in order to prevent a foreign company led by Gulgielmo Marconi from developing the medium in the United States (Engelmann 16).

RCA consisted of the industrial interests of General Electric, Westinghouse and AT&T. According to Engelmann: "General Electric and Westinghouse would manufacture, and RCA sell, radio sets; AT&T would manufacture transmitters and use radio telephony for its domestic business" (16). Members of the RCA consortium were also permitted to buy radio stations. The first radio broadcasting licenses were allocated in the United States in 1920; that year, the Western Electric station KDKA was the first to be awarded an experimental broadcasting license. However, the form of radio broadcasting that ultimately prevailed in the American context began only in 1922 when, as Ralph Engelmann notes: "AT&T established WEAF in New York City . . . [as] a new kind of station based on toll broadcasting" (18). The station soon determined that selling time, or commercially sponsored mass entertainment, would be more profitable than broadcasting messages for a fee.

Another factor that led to the blatantly commercial disposition of radio in the United States involved the networking of RCA, AT&T and Westinghouse radio stations. This began in 1923 with the telephone linking of New York's WEAF and another AT&T owned station in Washington (Engelmann 20). When individual stations began to network using telephone lines on a larger scale in the mid 1920s, RCA and General Electric as the "Big Two" radio producers began to operate their own affiliated radio broadcasting networks in conjunction with AT&T. In the face of anti-trust complaints, the RCA consortium was disbanded in 1926. However, the Westinghouse, AT&T, General Electric and RCA owned stations re-consolidated as the National Broadcasting Company and coast-to-coast networked transmissions began shortly afterward in 1928 (Englemann 20). As it turned out, "commercialization and centralization would go hand in hand" in the United States as all forms of non-commercial broadcasting were effectively driven off the airwaves. As S.J. Douglas notes: "The radio trust was thus able to co-opt the amateur vision of how radio should be used, and to use the airwaves for commercial ends, to try to promote cultural homogeneity, to mute or screen out diversity and idiosyncrasy, and to advance values consonant with consumer capitalism" (as cited in Engelmann 25).

As it developed under the governmental aegis of Department of Commerce, commercially sponsored American radio effectively functioned to interpellate or hail a nation of consumers. The disposition of the medium was very different in other national contexts where it was government-controlled; similarly, the BBC radio network under the paternalistic direction of Lord Reith developed a very different disposition from the Italian radio network run by the Mussolini-led *fascisti*. These national secondary voice cultures and secondary musical cultures were also projected abroad via short wave broadcasting as the first form of post-national mass communication. With the development of short-wave broadcasting in the late 1920s, each nation's secondary or mass-mediated culture and its communicative ideological apparatus were projected abroad in the service of hailing the subjects of other countries, or nationals who resided elsewhere. For this reason, radio was at the scene of the postmodern even as it was part of "second wave" electro-acoustically mediated "modern" voice culture of the 1920s.

In general, sound-recording techniques used in the 1920s and 1930s in the United States mimicked the disposition of context-free or high signal-to-noise ratio of "telephone voice" and the microphone and loudspeaker-enhanced address of "radio voice" as the first electronic medium, but American sound recordings also mimicked the commercial disposition of networked radio culture.[10] All of these factors produced a secondary or mass-mediated musical and spoken word "radio regime" with a highly commercial disposition. That disposition may have seemed natural to Americans but the disposition of radio voice as it evolved in the American context was not very effective as a form of technologically mediated "public speech" in comparison to that used by other broadcasting networks and the BBC in particular. In the 1920s and the 1930s, when America's international broadcasting system was random and privately controlled, the disposition of radio voice in international contexts was of little or import; however, in the 1940s and 1950s, after the VOA was founded, the necessity of producing a secondary voice culture with a less overtly commercial disposition would become more pressing.

The last of the "second wave" sound technologies involved the emergence of talkies, or sound films. Although it begins at the same time and involves many of the same figures, the trajectory of film sound recording was very different from that of the sound recording industry. Sound recording was introduced to the full-length feature film industry in 1927 with the release of *The Jazz Singer*. The film featured the Vitaphone disc recording system as a revival of the synchronized film/disc system that Edison had unsuccessfully attempted to introduce into the film industry in 1912 as part of his Diamond Disc recording system.[11] Lee De Forest also played an important role in the pre-history of film sound. As early as 1906, the inventor pursued the problem of applying sound waves to film. De Forest's system was based on that of Eugen Lauste, who pioneered the recording of a light modulated by sound waves directly onto film in 1903 (Read and Welch 280).[12] Lauste's innovation was to store sound waves on film as optical images and to reproduce them as sound; De Forest's task was that of amplifying the output of the electrical system that Lauste invented or finding a way of electronically enhancing it (Read and Welch 280).

By 1923, three separate sound-on-film optical recording methods were available (Millard 150). However, because of the prohibitive cost of converting from silent film theaters to sound film theaters, the film industry did not adopt any of the rival sound-on-film systems that were available until the advent of radio as a competing sound-based mass culture delivery system. Sound recording was introduced into the film industry using Vibraphone system, which was developed by Warner Brothers in association with AT&T. The disc-based system was based on a new recording speed and new playback medium. According to Read and Welch:

> The new discs were made up to 20 inches in diameter and in order to reduce surface noise to a tolerable level with the high amplification necessary, the former practice of putting abrasive in the surface material, which was still done in the commercial Victor records, was eliminated, resulting in a much smoother, but also less durable surface. (286)

With the development of low-friction acetate cellulose medium, recording speeds could be slowed for the first time, which allowed for recordings of a much longer duration. Since recording and reproduction speed is a function of sound frequencies, the pitch of the 33 1/3-*rpm* discs was also truer to the actual human speaking voice unlike the high-pitched sounds produced by many 78-*rpm* records. While the new medium produced much less surface noise than shellac discs and resulted in much superior sound quality, the new discs were much more fragile and could be played no more than twenty times.

Because of these deficiencies and the complexities of synchronization, the Vibraphone system was extremely transitional. According to Millard:

> The basic impracticality of using sound on disc was the result of the difficulties of synchronizing disc player and projector. There were too many things that could wrong in the projection booth, and even the slightest misjudgment in lining up the beginning of the reel of film with the disc could ruin synchronization and the whole performance. Discs were easily broken, lost, or mixed up and played in the wrong order. (156)

Shortly after Warner released *The Jazz Singer,* Fox and RKO began experimenting with rival methods of sound recording. The first full-length film features to use a photoelectric system of sound recording were made in 1927 and 1929 respectively by RKO. Beginning in 1927, Fox also used a sound-on-film system to generate newsreels (Schoenherr 5). With the application of photoelectrical sound-on-film recording, the 33 1/3-*rpm* Vitaphone synchronized acetate disc system developed by Warner became outdated.

Although the Vitaphone 33 1/3-*rpm* acetate disc system was discarded by the film industry, it went on to have an afterlife in radio as the format for pre-recorded radio programming. RCA-Victor began making transcription discs using a composite substance known as Vitrolac in 1929 in order to turn optical soundtracks into disc records for radio stations to play on the air (Schoenherr 6). These were the very first forms of so-called transcription records. Soon afterward, the American radio industry began experimenting with 33 and 1/3-*rpm* acetate discs for the purposes of recording radio performers' on-air broadcasts. Beginning in the early 1930s the radio industry began to use acetate covered transcription discs for the purposes of disseminating pre-recorded radio programming to its networked affiliates. According to Millard, transcription discs were "an efficient and convenient way to record programs and then mail them to other stations" (172). They also "allowed a local radio station to broadcast a show whenever it desired rather than take it from the network link " and to disseminate advertising nationally (173).

Despite its advantages, the acetate disc was not adopted by the sound recording industry. Radio standard sound recording depended not only on acetate discs but also on new forms of disc cutting and disc reading styli—and particularly on the crystal pickup as part of the pre-history of "doped" solid state semiconductors that later became the basis of postwar transistorized electronics. In fact, many technical innovations in sound recording were pioneered in the 1930s but did not attain mass commodity-form because of depressed economic conditions. Various types of radio phonographs were introduced into the home market beginning in 1926. RCA-Victor first tried to introduce the new 33 1/3 *rpm* recording speed in 1931 as part of a projected home recording system using plastic 33 1/3-*rpm* blank discs made from Vitrolac. RCA-Victor marketed blank discs and radio phonograph disc recorders for the purposes of recording radio broadcasts. The machines could also play a limited number of recordings that RCA made using the new 33 1/3-*rpm* speed. These were effectively the first forms of Long Playing records. However, in the Depression the public remained tied to the older forms of hardware that played the 78-*rpm* gramophone disc, particularly since the two-speed turntable systems required to record and playback 33 1/3 rpm records cost between $247 and $995 (Gelatt 252). The Victrolac medium was also subject to wear from the heavy pickup stylus; shellac alone remained study enough to withstand repeated playing before the era of crystal pick-up styli.

The sound recording industry collapsed with the onset of the Depression and the backlash against technologized culture and tinny and highly artificial electrical modern sound seems to have affected the sound recording industry much more severely than other mass culture industries. Only six million records were sold in the United States in 1932; this represented less than six percent of the annual record sales during 1927 (Gelatt 255). In the face of the collapse of the popular mass market, new types of record distribution emerged. These included by subscription-only society recordings and mail-order classical recordings from Europe. These alternate modes of consumption were driven by the distinctive tastes of the highbrow sound recording enthusiast whose patterns of consumption also drove the sound hardware industry; as Gelatt notes, sales of expensive electrical phonograph machines in the early and mid 1930s were driven by a dialectic of conspicuous consumption as a class-differentiated behavior. By 1933, the Depression had begun to abate. In 1934 RCA-Victor attempted to revive the record market by cutting the price of records and selling a two-speed player that played the first generation of full fidelity records, which extended from 30 *cps* - 8,000 *cps*. However, the he more lifelike recording and playback speed did not catch on in part because of competition from the radio, sound film and jukebox industries.

Different forms of non-mass sound recording media were also developed in the 1920s and 1930s after the demise of the phonograph in 1929. The eight-inch aluminum *Talk-O-Phone* disc was the most important of these. Telephone companies first developed the *Talk-O-Phone* for the novelty purpose of allowing telephone listeners to access pre-recorded weather reports by phone. However, the *Talk-0-Phone* was also adapted for the purpose of sound recording. Recording studios using the aluminum disc *Talk-O-Phone* system sprang up all over the United States. According to Read and Welch: "The sound quality provided with the best discs and equipment was often excellent" (290). Metal and acetate disc recorders of different types also came onto the market in the late 1930s. Steel wire recorders were marketed for the purposes of taking business dictation. Because of their cost, these 1930s era recording machines were not in the main marketed to home consumers but they were adopted for use in school, college and university settings.

Other forms of sound recording media were introduced in other national contexts, particularly with regard of the radio/sound recording interface. Margaret Fischer notes that the BBC adapted the German steel tape recording system by 1931 (138-9). The BBC used a *Marconi-Stille* recording machine as an adaptation of the German *Blattnerphone* system. American steel wire recording and German steel tape recording developed independently of one another but both were based on an alternative system of magnetic sound recording that had been first been developed in 1899 by the Danish engineer Vladimir Poulsen. According to Gelatt:

> Poulsen . . . based his invention, the Telegraphone, on the ability of an electromagnet to create varying magnetic patterns in a piece of steel relative to the varying electrical magnetic impulses actuating it. Poulsen used an ordinary carbon telephone transmitter to convert sound into electrical impulses, and these in turn were made to actuate an electro-magnetic recording head. Directly beneath this recording head passed demagnetized steel wire or ribbon traveling at a steady speed, which as it sped past the head was then magnetized according to the electrical

> impulses generated by the transmitter. To reproduce sound magnetized on wire or ribbon, the process merely had be reversed: the magnetized steel passed under the electromagnet, producing varying electrical impulses that were then converted into audible sound by a telephone receiver. (284-5)

The Telegraphone system had many advantages over the phonograph and gramophone systems. The magnetized steel medium did not produce the mechanical friction that was generated by a stylus reading a grooved medium for the purposes of playback. As a result, steel wire and steel ribbon recording remained intact after being played over 2,000 times. Steel wire and ribbon based machines also recorded and played back recordings of up to sixty minutes (Gellatt 285).

The major drawback of the Telegraphone system was that it relied on carbon telephone transmitters. However, the potential of steel wire and steel tape media was greatly enhanced with the development of condenser microphones specifically intended for electrical sound recording and the mass culture industry. With the invention of microphones specifically adapted to the needs of the mass culture industry and the series of electronic amplifiers that were integrated into both the sound recording and the sound playback process, the all-electrical magnetized steel system that had first been developed by Poulsen was revived. Steel and metal mediata still retained some shortcomings with regard to their ability to record and playback the full sound spectrum. However, in 1928 Dr. Fritz Pfluemer patented an entirely new medium for purposes of sound recording. Pfluemer replaced steel tape with a strip of paper that had been magnetized by the application of powdered iron oxide (Gelatt 286). In 1932, the tape medium was refined by BASF/I.G. Farben, which joined with the industrial interest AEG—an affiliate of the German telecommunications giant Telefunken—to develop a tape recording machine that used reels of plastic tape coated with iron oxide (Schoenherr 7). By 1935, Telefunken had produced a machine that recorded and played back the new medium. The quality of the tape medium was not such that it could be used for purposes for reproducing music; it was marketed only as a voice transcription machine (Gelatt 286).

The dialectic between American and German interests to produce new forms of interpersonal communication, mass communication, and mass media characterized the entire period between 1888 and 1939; it involved many different fields of media, including television. This dialectic was explicitly militarized during the Second World War. Sound recording, in particular, acquired a number of military applications in the war. For example, Americans recorded enemy communication on disc for the purposes of crypto-analysis (Millard 196). When it was determined to be advantageous from the point of view of distinguishing between the sound-signatures of British and German submarines, engineers from Decca Records cooperated with the RAF to develop the full fidelity sound recording and sound reproducing system, which dramatically extended the frequency range of sound recording (Millard 198).[13] However, the most important of these wartime innovations concerned the radio/sound recording interface.

The American Office of War Information or OWI was at the center of all wartime media systems, whether domestic or international, because it was at the heart of America's program of wartime information, or wartime "propaganda." The OWI was founded in 1942. It involved the consolidation of various aspects of America's earlier anti-fascist ideological apparatuses including the ICCA and the Department of Cultural Relations as part of the State Department (both of which were founded in 1938 to combat the spread of fascist influence in Latin America); the Office of Facts and Figures, which was founded in 1941 to co-ordinate the American defensive effort against fascism, or fascism within America, and headed by Archibald MacLeish; and the Foreign Information Service, which was launched in 1941 and headed by former playwright and *Vanity Fair* editor Robert E. Sherwood and which collected intelligence and disseminated information overseas.[14] The OWI anti-fascist ideological apparatus consisted of radiophonic, filmic, and printed modalities among other forms of media. As an instrument of electronic presence that proceeded military presence, radio was arguably the most important of these.

In its international aspect, the OWI radio apparatus consisted of three separate organs—the Psychological Warfare Branch or PWB, the Armed Forces Radio Service or AFRS, and the Voice of America network or VOA. The first of these organs, the PWB, was devoted to using various forms of media in the service of psychological warfare. It played a prominent role in the invasion of Tunisia during the African campaign in November of 1942 and in the spring invasion of Italy the following year. Civilian populations and enemy troops were targeted by the PWB—most often by pamphlets that were dropped from airplanes urging them to surrender. PWB-controlled media systems also played a role in initiating the re-democratizing of formerly fascist media systems. Newsprint and other print-based informational and cultural forms played a role in this process after Allied forces landed and sometimes immediately beforehand, but radio was central because it *proceeded* military occupation (Winkler 112-148).

While the objectives of the PWB were military, there was also a direct continuity between PWB and the Armed Forces Radio Services, or an overlap of their operations, which were both under direct military command and hence administered by the Army Signal Corps, and the Office of War Information which supplied pre-recorded radio programming. The AFRS was founded in February of 1942 with an explicit mandate to provide cultural programming and information to military personnel stationed abroad. However, the AFRS also had a mandate to broadcast to "secondary" audiences of local civilians and any enemy personnel who might also be within earshot.[15] The AFRS network was provided with pre-recorded discs of domestic radio programming without commercial messages. The OWI also copied recordings of national musics and copied material from ethnological and other sound archives which had never been released commercially but which was valuable from a public relations point of view.

Civilians in enemy and enemy-occupied territory were also hailed by the *Voice of America* as America's short-wave radio network, which was also founded in February of 1942. The BBC pioneered this new form of broadcasting into enemy and enemy-occupied territory as part of its wartime services. Essentially, the BBC projected a simulacrum of a liberal democratic communicative ideological apparatus into politically closed areas and most notably into occupied France. The BBC model of projective broadcasting would later be adapted by the *Voice of America.* French language programming would play an extremely important role during the development of the *VOA*. However, according to Dizzard: "The 'Voice of America as operated by the pre-OWI Coordinator of Information Archibald MacLeish began transmissions in German" (70).[16] These early broadcasts were part of the VOA's explicit mandate to hail or interpellate the citizens of fascist Germany as liberal-democratic citizens. (This mandate would extend to the citizens of CP countries after the war.) By 1943, the VOA network was broadcasting to radio listeners all over the world in a total of forty languages

(Vincent as excerpted in Roach 193). Originally, VOA programs were beamed from New York in the short-wave modality; gradually, these were supplemented by AM broadcasts as radio transmitters were installed around the world as part of a system of local relays.

Music as a universal and highly affective medium was most essential for communicating the virtues of democracy and "the American way of life" on each of these different wartime communicative apparatuses. Two forms of music were preferred in this form of cultural warfare. The first of these was art music as a category that included both symphonic or classical music and modern experimental music. The second category involved folk music from every region of the globe but particularly hybridized folk music that synthesized local and national cultural traditions with the wider tradition of Western popular music (Cowell 224). Music, which produces a high degree affect, was effectively weaponized in the service of ideological and psychological warfare. Such was the importance of cultural radio broadcasts that retreating German troops took great care to break every single gramophone record that might possibly be used by the advancing Allied forces for the purposes of radio broadcasts in Italy, for example. As a result, the AFRS had to amass an inventory of Italian-language based records for this purpose (Cowell 224). These records were provided by the OWI, sometimes from Italian-language radio programming that originated in the United States.

However, the OWI also copied enormous amounts of sound recordings from heterogeneous sources including commercial sound recordings and archival sound recordings in the service of providing its various radio operations with pre-recorded programming. In effect, this new form of non-commercial cultural production mediated the production of new genres of sound documents and shaped the harvesting of private and semi-private sound documents from the larger voice and sound recording archive—fundamentally changing the disposition of sound recording not only in wartime but also in the postwar era. While local audiences were subject to American radio programming and American music, GIs were also exposed to entirely new music and to programming that originated from within the wider OWI sound recording archive. The social aging of AFRS programming or radio in wartime would also be a factor of the "distinctive" tastes of the FM-audiophile as part of what I term postwar cult of high fidelity.

The vinylite medium that drove the postwar "audio revolution" also originated in wartime. Legendarily, the medium was developed by the OWI as a result of the Japanese blockade of the Malayan Peninsula, which cut Americans off from a supply of shellac. The vinyl medium, then, was developed specifically as a means of disseminating wartime information or "propaganda programs on disc" (Kolodin 41). As Read and Welch note:

> The Office of War Information needed immediately an unbreakable plastic-type material that could be easily shipped throughout the world and on which propaganda programs could be recorded and distributed with the least possible delay. (425)

The chemical basis of the hardy vinylite medium involved synthetic vinyl resins that had been developed by Union Carbide in the mid 1930s, which had found their first applications in the manufacture of unbreakable telephone and radio cabinet components (Millard 203). Unlike other forms of disc sound media, vinyl discs could be transported anywhere in the world. Not only were they virtually unbreakable, they withstood severe heat and humidity. The flexible vinylite medium, which bent around the pickup stylus rather than resisting it, had the side benefit of dramatically reducing the surface noise on voice and musical recordings. By the end of the war, some thirty million Victory Discs or V-discs had been distributed worldwide as sound recordings and pre-recorded radio programming.[17]

Germany also refined voice and sound media during the war, particularly with regard to the sound recording/radio interface. One of the most important of these innovations concerned the introduction of a new method of recording in 1941 that depended on alternating current rather than direct current, which led to the introduction of high frequency biasing (Schoenherr 7). As a result, the range of sound frequencies that could be recorded in the upper range of the sound frequency spectrum extended up to the 10,000 *cps* range, which was significantly above the V-disc standard. This improvement allowed for much more faithful and lifelike reproduction of sound (Gelatt 287). Much like the V-disc, the lifelike medium was also appropriated for tactical and psychological purposes: as Millard notes, Nazi Germany was "great consumer of propaganda messages, and tape proved to be the ideal medium to carry out this material" (197). These taped sound recordings were most often used in conjunction with radio as a medium of mass communication. The medium was also used in conjunction with radio for tactical purposes to simulate military presence. In all but unoccupied areas, taped radio broadcasts allowed German troops to retreat with far fewer casualties than they might have otherwise have sustained, particularly since tape could run continuously for as long as four hours.

The existence of an improved form of audiotape was confirmed when Allied Forces captured Radio Luxembourg in September of 1944 (Gelatt 287). Soon afterwards, American industrial interests began the process of refining the medium for the purposes of commercial sound recording. Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing developed the 3M brand of Scotch magnetic audiotape in 1947. It dramatically extended the wartime standard of audiotape recording from 80 to 10,000 *cps* to between 30 to 15,000 *cps*. The Magnetophone was originally used but the American-made Ampex tape recording machine was subsequently developed a year later in 1948 (Schoenherr 8). The radio and sound recording industries converted *en masse* to the new sound recording system that year.

Audiotape revolutionized the postwar sound recording industry. For the first time, a range of sound *frequencies* closely approximating the range of human hearing could be recorded. As a result, higher frequency orchestral music was recorded for the first time. The sonic complexities of vocal or musical performance as a speech or sound event resonating in a particular acoustic environment also registered in a sound recording medium. As a result sound recording became "life-like." Finally, audiotape permitted the editing of sound as several performances could be spliced together in order produce a single perfect performance. Magnetic audiotape, then, was the first medium to permit the creative manipulation of sound as a medium. Essentially, audiotape caused a shift from sound recording to sound engineering.

Although the divide between partial and full sound spectrum recording was a particularly important moment in the reproduction and industrialization of music, it was also one in the recording and reproduction of the human speaking voice. Magnetic audiotape was the first medium to capture the complex *harmonics* of the human speaking voice, the *timbre* of which had so far resisted recording. The industrialization of the human voice as recorded and engineered in magnetic audiotape thus involved a moment in the technologization of the word in Walter Ong's terms. It was a particularly important moment in psycho-acoustics in that the voice of the technologically-mediated "other" effectively simulated that of a physically proximate vocal intimate for the first time. It was during this technological moment that the industrialized human voice, as recorded and engineered in audiotape and stored in the LP as a full sound spectrum aural commodity-object, emerged as a supplement not only to print as a verbal mass medium but also to the linguistic matrices of primary o/aurality. Audiotape also permitted the editing and engineering of a speech event so that for the first time spoken word performance could be manipulated in a way that was equivalent to the typesetting that is involved in print publishing.

For several reasons, including the lack of playback machine designed for the home market and the relatively high cost of the tape medium compared to disc sound media, pre-recorded tape did not become a mass commodity until 1954. Instead, sound recording and sound reproduction was characterized by the technical dialectic between audiotape, as a relatively restricted medium of sound recording and sound editing, and the vinyl Long Playing record, or LP, as a sound reading medium or play-only mass commodity and the first full sound spectrum aural commodity. The LP was the second element of the postwar audio revolution. Like magnetic audiotape, it was also introduced in 1947. Victor and Columbia both explored the commercial possibilities of the vinyl record that had first been developed by the OWI. However, Columbia won the battle to commercialize the medium when Peter Goldmark perfected the microgroove machine-lathed Long-Playing record, or LP.

Goldmark's innovation consisted in radically increasing the number of grooves per inch, from around 100 to between 224 and 300, which dramatically extended the playing time of each record (Read and Welch 426). As a result of a dramatic increase in the number of grooves that could be inscribed in a single record and the adoption of a slower recording and playback time of 33 and 1/3-*rpm,* the duration of sound recordings was extended from slightly over four minutes on the old 78-*rpm* shellac medium, and about eight minutes on the first "high fidelity" records of the mid-1930s, to about twenty-three minutes per side on the LP. This innovation enabled the interrupted recording of orchestral movements for the first time. In addition to his introduction of precision machine-lathed records, Goldmark also made several improvements to the reproducing apparatus, which resulted in a dramatically improved signal-to-noise ratio. The most important of these was the introduction of a transistorized lightweight tone arm, which dramatically reduced the pressure that the reading stylus bought to bear on the record surface. For the first time, consumers could buy recordings that reproduced live vocal and musical performances without experiencing the significant amounts of noise that were generated from pick-up.

The LP's advantages as a sound reproduction medium seem obvious. Indeed, as soon as the LP was introduced, *Newsweek*—echoing the "atomic" semiotics of postwar media shift as a shift in cultural and communicative capital as an analogue to military power—explicitly likened the impact of the medium to a "phonographic version of the atom bomb."[18] However, while many technical innovations in sound media and sound recording techniques were developed in the period immediately after the War, the potential applications of each—and hence their form and disposition—did not instantly consolidate and the period between 1948 and 1950 was characterized by a high degree of uncertainty in sound recording markets as consumers and record companies waited to see which of several forms of sound storage and playback media and hardware systems would prevail. In particular, this two-year period was characterized by "the war of the speeds" as Columbia's 33 and 1/3-*rpm* LP was challenged by Victor 45-*rpm* record. Many smaller record companies preferred to stick with the 78-*rpm* shellac record until a winner was determined. (The 45-*rpm* format went on to develop a different social life as a specialized medium for pop singles.) The LP or Long Play "moment," then, really began around 1950.

The third element that drove the postwar audio revolution consisted of innovations in playback hardware in the form of high fidelity or "hi-fi" audio component systems. The hi-fi movement also began between 1947 and 1948 during the roughly six-month period that witnessed so many other technical innovations. As Gelatt notes:

> The slogan "high fidelity" had been bandied about since 1934. It usually meant nothing at all—except employment for copy writers. America's leading providers of radio and phonograph sets held strongly to the

> opinion that most listeners preferred music reproduced at low fidelity (soft, mellow, and flabby) to music that was reproduced at high fidelity (loud, brilliant, and full-bodied) . . . . A few stubborn souls refused to take what was offered in the name of "high fidelity." Their ears urged them on to investigate, and they found that the components for genuine high fidelity reproduction—powerful and flexible amplifiers, sensitive and carefully balanced pick-ups, large and heavy loud-speakers mounted in separate enclosures—could be obtained, expensively, at certain radio supply houses. (297)

Hi-fi sound began with the enthusiasm of demobbed GI's who had first become familiar with radio components during the war. They appropriated these in the service of constructing differentiated audio component systems. The cult of high fidelity was also underwritten by government loans that allowed some of the GI's who had worked as engineers during the war to found small businesses that specialized in the sale of hi-fi audio component systems along with other forms of home electronics (Millard 209).

However, while the cult of high fidelity was a hardware driven phenomenon that represented the beginning of a technical divide between vacuum-tube era electronics and transistorized solid state era electronics, the software that drove the postwar audio revolution was the LP record. As Gelatt notes, the introduction of LP records "with their heightened musical attractiveness and acoustical potentialities" played a strong role in turning "the quest for high fidelity to something like a national mania" (297). Beginning in 1949 and extending throughout the 1950s, this mania materialized in postwar Audio Fairs. As Gelatt frames this phenomenon:

> . . . strange sonic saturnalias called Audio Fairs were held in several large American cities, whither thousands of high fidelity addicts came to bask in the shattering cacophony produced by a hundred exhibitors demonstrating their wares in unnatural proximity" (298).

The cult of high fidelity was often framed by a fetishized rhetoric of narcosis. These semiotics would appear to reflect the fact that high fidelity innovations were based on the "doping" of solid state materials as a supplement to vacuum-tube era electronics.[19] This rhetoric also expressed the psycho-acoustic or affective properties of postwar sound reproduction hardware including the low frequency vibration that was experienced in the bones, skin and teeth, and the strong physiological effects of piercing supersonic high frequency sounds; many audiophiles experienced these as a drug-like sensation and occasionally as pain. This rhetoric, then, described the body's penetration (or inscription) by waves of electronically mediated sound.

Like the description of the LP as an "atom bomb," descriptions of Audio Fairs were consistently rendered using a militarized rhetoric that reflected both the origins of postwar sound reproduction hardware in wartime, which reflected a certain displacement of the discursive energies of "war" and "revolution" into the commercialized field of postwar media as a field of symbolic production that was characterized by a wider postwar shift in communicative and cultural capital from Europe to America and from Britain to America in particular. That recordings of literature and recordings of classical music as secondary or mass-mediated performance genres became the "content" of the LP was also clearly related to the social aging of wartime reading and listening formations—particularly in the European theater of war—as part of the political unconscious of the LP medium.

Recordings of classical music in particular drove sales of the monaural LP. To some degree, this was determined by the technical properties of full sound spectrum recording, which made the recording of the full range of orchestral music possible for the first time. That content was also dictated by the more benefits of recording music in war-ravaged European contexts where classically trained musicians worked for a pittance in contrast to the heavily unionized American scene. (That classical music became the content of the LP moment was almost certainly shaped by the seven-month strike and ban on recording instituted by the AMF in the first half of 1948.) The turn to classical music was also shaped by the more political exigencies of rehabilitating German music in the aftermath of the war and of re-articulating Western musical cultures as one aspect of so-called "Western civilization." As part of the broader phenomenon of postwar mass culture, that content also appears to have been a function of the role that classical music as played on the BBC and OWI networks had played in rallying spirits of the fighting troops during the war and functioning as a sonic index of "civilization." Paul Fussell, for example, reports on a captain who while participating in the reduction of Monte Cassino "attended to Schubert's *Unfinished Symphony* while the shells and bombs thundered away" and another captain who, in the midst of the fighting at Normandy, "waited all day to hear Brahms' *Fourth Symphony*" (183). In this sense, the postwar classical recording industry represented a kind of social aging of music during wartime, and a postwar return to a culture of classicism, as part of the political unconscious of the LP medium, as well as more prosaic factors such as the musicians' strike.

The translation of contemporary literature and of the so-called "classical" textual tradition into secondary voice media was determined by factors that on the whole were remarkably similar. Like classical recordings, spoken word records were extremely economical to produce.[20] Poetry had also been an index of civilization during the war both as read aloud in primary and secondary or technologized performance contexts and as published and disseminated in its printed modality. While poetry did not need to be culturally rehabilitated *per se*, during the war modernist poets appear to have undergone a re-assessment of the value of civilization, of that of humanist culture based on the ideology and media of classicism, and of that of mass culture or media of reproduction. Modernist anti-humanism, a racialized rhetoric against the supposedly Semitic origins of metered verse, and an outright rejection of the cultural forms favored by the plebians or underclass were simply not politically tenable positions after the outbreak of the war. Arguably, it is the wider mobilization of writers and the intelligentsia in defense of culture and civilization and the role of poetry more narrowly as anti-fascist "technology" that is the historical origin of Raymond Williams' "two faces of modernism." In broad terms, the spoken word industry as it emerged after the war, and most notably in the Caedmon catalogue, appears to have involved a memorialization of reading in wartime and of poetry in wartime more narrowly.

Even as the "content" or secondary performance genres of the third wave of sound recording differed from those of first and second waves, the disposition of the third wave of sound recording was very different from either the first or second waves of sound recording. When one listens to a sound recording that "reproduces" what Roland Barthes refers to as a bodily grain as in the case of any vocal or musical recording, one does not listen merely to a recorded speech or sound event. One also listens to the disposition of the sound recording medium and that of the playback machine. This is the machinic "grain" of the sound recording technology and the playback medium as a supplement to a speech or sound event and the bodily grain of the performer. "Gramophone voice" is not "LP voice" is not "CD voice." This disposition is not technically determined but is instead the result of a field of struggle around each technology during the moment of its emergence. As a reification of material conditions of social struggle, the dispositions of each medium and media machine that emerged during the first, second and third waves of post-alphabetical media were very different. This left a trace not only on the voice and sound documents that were preserved in the sound recording archive during each period but also in the formal properties of each type of document.

In general, the first wave of technical innovation in the 1890s was characterized by the distinctive personalities of the age of inventor/entrepreneurs such as Thomas Edison, Emile Berliner or the Pathé and Lumière brothers. Even as there are significant differences between the disposition of phonograph and gramophone recording, overall the disposition of the first wave of sound recording was fundamentally inclusive in that the field the field of sound recording is where minorities first gained access to the cultural reproduction machine. The first wave is the scene of the long and well-established relationship between sound recording and minority culture, which continues to this day. In contrast, industrial conglomerates—including the Bell/Western Electric, Bell/AT&T and AEG/Telefunken—developed the second wave of technical innovation. Second wave sound recording was imprinted by telephone voice and by the penetration of the field of sound recording by radio capital. The disposition of second wave sound recording was also imprinted by the fact that sound recording was used only for one-way playback, or mass cultural inscription. Although many of the innovations in the second wave of post print mass media and mass communication were originally developed in a military context, these innovations were deployed in the mass communication and mass culture industries in a time of peace. This was not the case many of the technical innovations of the third wave of post-print mass media and mass communication.

Like second wave media technologies, third wave technologies were also developed in the context of warfare. However, they were not commercially developed exclusively within the postwar mass culture industry but in conjunction with a heterogeneously technologized ideological apparatus that was particular to the postwar period. The entire anti-fascist media apparatus that was developed in wartime was quickly re-deployed against the spread of communism in the postwar period. In general, postwar media and postwar media systems were infused with a democratic and democratizing disposition that was very different from the equally ideological but more overtly commercial disposition of the second wave of post print mass media and post-print mass communication. An overtly ideological component, then, was inserted in the shift from "modern" second wave mass culture to "postmodern" third wave mass culture. Essentially, the third wave was characterized by an appropriation of mass communication and mass media in the service of mass education, which disseminated a liberal democratic political ideology—not only within particular national contexts but also internationally. This appropriation, or the turn to post-print mass media and mass communication in the service of mass education and ideological inscription is essentially the scene of the postwar postmodern.

The postmodern third wave, then, was a supplement to history of the modern second wave of mass communication and mass culture. It involved an institutionally and discursively mediated response to the threat that had been fascist regimes of secondary orality and a historical or dialectical resolution of politically polarized prewar media systems more generally. On a national scale, third wave sound recording of the postwar period was also developed dialectically in opposition to the commercial disposition of the second wave of sound recording. While the reading of poetry on disc during the third wave of sound recording as a form of secondary literacy became a way of supplementing prewar media systems, and of technologies of secondary orality as developed by the fascists in particular, that voicing also appears to have supplemented the commercial disposition American radio and film voice and secondly of countering "BBC voice" as a globally mediated secondary voice culture. American poets would be called upon to articulate a postwar secondary or mass mediated voice culture that supplemented the commercial disposition of America's mass culture industry. This cultural project appears to have been undertaken in the spirit of producing a national poetry recording project but also of legitimating a postwar media shift from print as the scene of the European modern to postwar sound and image reproduction media and electronic mass communication as the scene of the American postmodern—including a shift from a culture of reading to a culture of listening.

Such as it existed prior to the founding of Caedmon Records, the American spoken word poetry recording archive was a part of a wider voice archive rather than an archive of sounded paraliterary performance *per se*. The voice documents of that archive were also clearly shaped by the moments of each sound recording and playback medium and by the disposition of each wave of sound recording technology. For the most part, commercial spoken word recording was not widespread during the era of partial sound spectrum recording and particularly in the acoustical era. It is widely noted that the very first recording to be played back in public involved Thomas Edison's recitation of "Mary Had a Little Lamb" in the offices of *Scientific American* in December of 1877. However, sound recording of literary figures began more properly with the second-generation phonograph. Edison's agent Colonel Gourard made recordings of Alfred Tennyson and Robert Browning in 1888 and 1889 respectively. These appear to have been made purely as a means of generating publicity for Edison's machine, however. They were never published as public voice documents.

Beginning in the 1900s, the Gramophone Company also made recordings of well-known actors reading literature. Like the voices of opera singers, the voices of actors, who were skilled in techniques of dramatic declamation, projected into the gramophone disc medium considerably better than the voices of poets and authors. A few recordings of literary figures were made in the early acoustical era. The Russian branch of the Gramophone Company recorded Tolstoy in 1909, for example. Most of these were made for voice archives and voice museums. They began to be made during the period of technical innovation that enabled the first orchestral recordings. *La Musée de la Parole* recorded Apollinaire and others in the early teens, for example. However, while spoken word recordings of literary celebrities were made for archival purposes during the acoustical era, they were not commercially released public voice documents. In part, this was because of the technical deficiencies of sound recording with regard to its ability to capture the amplitude, frequency, and harmonics of sound waves. Secondly, the archive of voice recording during this era was shaped by the popular disposition of first wave sound recording.

The consolidation of educational recording in the late acoustical gramophone era and early electrical era represented a limited exception to this rule. Linguaphone pioneered this type of recording. Founded in the early 1900s in London by Jacques Roston, a friend of George Bernard Shaw's, Linguaphone initially developed the gramophone recording for the purpose of learning foreign languages. Linguaphone was essentially at the scene of the adult education movement. Educators rather than literary figures made most of these recordings. However, included in the Linguaphone catalogue were lectures—and later readings—by noted literary figures. Shaw made two records for the label entitled "Spoken English" and "Broken English," for example. Institutionally situated modern educational recording consolidated in the mid-1920s in the British context and slightly later in the American context. HMV and other smaller labels privately pressed many of the paraliterary voice documents of the British sound recording archive. These were not available as commercial sound recordings but were instead published privately in ways that are analogous to private printing.

Interestingly, recordings of James Joyce straddle the technical divide between acoustical and electrical era voice recording, and private and educational or institutional recording. As is well known, Joyce's publisher Sylvia Beach undertook to make an acoustical era recording of the author at the Paris offices of HMV in 1924. Joyce was recorded reading the Aeolus passage out of *Ulysses*. Only thirty copies of the record were pressed for private circulation (Roach 198-201). C.K. Ogden, the author of *Basic English* and a professor of Linguistics at Cambridge, recorded Joyce much more successfully in the electrical era. Joyce was recorded reading "Anna Livia Plurabelle" from the as-yet-untitled work that later became *Finnegans Wake*. The record was engineered at the Hayes, Middlesex studios of HMV and pressed for Ogden's Cambridge Orthological Institute (Mason 1-2). Ogden also recorded a number of other modern authors; these recordings were available by subscription.

Britain had a relatively vigorous history of both educational and commercial spoken word recording during the electrical gramophone disc era. In 1929, the Dominion Record Company launched the first series of recordings to focus on the literary spoken word in the form of a twelve-disc 78-*rpm* album that included recordings of Rebecca West, Rose Macauley and A.A. Milne among others. HMV joined the field slightly later in 1934, after the first standard of so-called full fidelity recording in the 30-8,000 *cps* range was achieved, with a two-disc recording Walter de la Mare reading his works. Britain also pioneered the field of poetry recordings intended for international audiences with the founding of the International Educational Society, which issued recordings of British poets between 1929 and 1931. The BBC was by far the largest producer of voice documents in the United Kingdom. Beginning in the 1930s, many broadcast lectures and readings by British poets and authors were recorded. These were not commercially published as public voice documents, however.

Educational and cultural sound recording projects followed a slightly different trajectory in the United States. The major recorders in the American context were institutional recorders, and most notably Columbia and Harvard. Professor Cabell Greet directed Columbia University's recording project, which founded in 1926 after a visit to Columbia by Vachel Lindsay who had been unsuccessful in his attempt to persuade Victor to record him (208). Greet went to record a number of poets and to found a line of educational recordings—initially in the aluminum disc Talk-0-Phone medium but later in the instantaneous acetate disc medium used by radio recorders. Columbia is particularly important because it housed the Brander Matthews Dramatic Voice Museum, which systematically archived heterogeneous recordings of poets that originated from their radio performances. The museum included recordings of T.S. Eliot, Gertrude Stein, Conrad Aiken, Alfred Kreymborg, Edna St. Vincent Millay, Edgar Lee Masters and others. The National Council of Teachers of English later distributed some of these voice documents in the 78-*rpm* format beginning in the late 1930s (Roach 209). Professor Frederick Packard also launched a recording project in 1931 at Harvard as a systematic project to record all of the poets who came to read and lecture at there including T.S. Eliot, Ezra Pound, Marianne Moore, William Carlos Williams, Robert Frost, Archibald MacLeish and E.E. Cummings (Roach 54). These recordings could be ordered on the Harvard Vocarium label.[21]

Archibald MacLeish as Librarian of Congress undertook another important institutional initiative to record American poets. The Library of Congress Recording Laboratory project was launched in 1941. Poets who recorded for the project included T.S. Eliot, Robert Frost, Wallace Stevens, Marianne Moore, William Carlos Williams, Edna St. Vincent Millay, Robert Graves, Conrad Aiken, Henry Reed, e. e. cummings and Carl Sandburg. While the Recording Laboratory project was undertaken in the spirit of establishing a national spoken word poetry archive, the evidence would tend to suggest that many writers were first recorded for broadcast over one of the OWI radio networks during the warr, particularly since MacLeish was at the center of America's wartime media systems. MacLeish served as Librarian of Congress until 1944. However, the Congress Recording Laboratory recorded contemporary poets most intensively in the period between 1944 and 1949.

The United States has a comparatively small number of voice documents that originated in the commercial field of cultural production. Of these, many involved transcriptions of poets' radio performances. RCA-Victor published 78-*rpm* recordings of Edna St. Vincent Millay's radio performances in the forties along with a recording of Robert Frost, for example. Decca published the earliest commercial spoken word recording of a poet to be made in the United States in the form of Carl Sandburg's 1936 poem *The People, Yes.* A small number of educational labels also published recordings of poets reading their works aloud. The most important of these were Garwick Records, which published e. e. cummings, William Carlos Williams, and Vachel Lindsay as part of its *Contemporary Poets* series, and the smaller label Erpi, which had released two recordings of Gertrude Stein based on her performances on NBC radio in 1934 and 1935. Columbia Records spanned the commercial and educational fields to some extent. Like British educational recorders, the label specialized in *spoken text* recordings of literature read by actors. Columbia served the educational recording market through such *spoken text* documents as the *Masterpieces of Literature* series, released in conjunction with the National Council of Teachers of English. Narrators of historical literature on these recordings included Basil Rathbone and Norman Corwin, the OWI dramatist who had written the wartime radio series *This is War!*[22]

However, with the exception of Columbia's foundational 1949 *Pleasure Dome* anthology and a few of the Harvard educational recordings, almost all of these voice documents were published in the 78-*rpm* gramophone disc medium. Overall, the high noise-to-signal ratio produced by poor recording techniques and the limitations of playback software in the noisy shellac gramophone disc medium significantly interfered with the experience of listening to any spoken voice recording. In one of his first columns on the subject in *The Saturday Review*—which significantly began to review both spoken word and classical recordings in 1947—critic and wartime poetry anthologist Henry Canby noted:

> None of the Harvard poetry recordings are up to top post-war standards of high fidelity voice recording. With a cut-off of about 6,000 cycles, the vital sibilant sounds are touch-and-go; those voices with the sharpest edge and strongest hissing sounds come over best; others simply lithp [sic].[23]

Nor were the spoken word recordings that were published by commercial record companies much better. In a very different review in *The New* Yorker, critic Ruth C. Morton comically described an unsuccessful attempt to return a 78-*rpm* record of Edna St. Vincent Millay on the grounds that the last of the five sonnets to have been included on the B-side had been suddenly cut off mid-way through the thirteenth line of the sonnet.[24] In sum, prior to the era of high fidelity poetry recordings produced by Caedmon Records, the voice of the poet was always deeply compromised by the noise of sound recording and sound storage media itself and by poor sound production values.

This was the state of spoken word publishing in America before Caedmon Records was founded. Through their positions and position-takings, Holdridge and Mantell would shape the disposition of the postwar spoken word recording industry through their choice to record Dylan Thomas and the first generation of stylistically innovative American poets and their decision to record the sound-saturated medium of poetry more generally as the spoken word "content" of the LP moment. In the process, they also produced a secondary or mass-mediated voice culture as software for postwar talking machines. This secondary voice culture supplemented not only print, but the complex legacy of second wave "modern" sound recording both within America and internationally, as part of the broader scene of the postwar postmodern.

NOTES

[1] I do not discuss audiotape as a "fourth wave" playback medium, which has been well covered by many other commentators.

[2] For an account of Cros' proposed machine, see Gelatt p. 23.

[3] Berliner was not an inventor on the scale of Edison but he designed a telephone transmitter that he sold to Bell for $25,000. Bell kept Berliner on a retainer for several years afterward, which gave the inventor the time he needed to perfect the gramophone.

---

[4] As Millard notes: "Although we call them *shellac records*, shellac was only one element in a complicated mix of materials, which included fillers (such as slate and limestone), binders, lubricants (to cut down on friction as the stylus moved along the groove and to ease the removal of the blank from the stamper, and abrasives (to grind the point of the stylus to conform to the shape of the groove)" (202).

[5] Pathé was founded by two bar owners who began producing cylinder phonographs in 1894 because so many patrons tried to buy the graphophone they had installed in their establishment (Gelatt 101-3). Pathé originally used the vertical wax cylinder system developed by Graphophone. In 1906, the company switched to vertical disc records, which were subsequently copied in 1912 by Thomas Edison. *Pathé* continued to use an alternative to the gramophone and the gramophone disc until 1920, which was no doubt a factor in the distinctively autonomous character of the French popular music industry.

[6] Kirster Malm has outlined how this domination occurred in his analysis of the very different business cultures of gramophone and tape or audio-cassette music industries. As he notes: "In 1910, the Gramophone Company, partly owned by Victor, had made over 14,000 recordings throughout Asia and North Africa . . . excluding the Caucasus and Central Asia. In an agreement of 1907 the two companies divided the world market into to two separate spheres of interest. Victor got the Americas, China, Japan, and the Philippines, while the Gramophone Company got the rest of the world. Columbia was active in Latin America, Japan, China, and Western Europe. The Pathé company had branches in North Africa, Russia, and Japan. The Lindstrom Company and other German companies were recording in North and South Africa, the Near East, Southern Asia and the Far East." (351)

[7] As Millard explains this phenomenon: "The coon song came from the minstrel shows that supposedly represented "genuine darky life in the South" but which were the work of white performers in grease pain or burnt cork . . . . Although inspired by the African American culture of the slave plantation, the minstrel shows were a travesty of slave music and dance arranged for white audiences" (96).

[8] In 1912, the Big Three—Victor, Columbia and Edison—remained a monopoly. By 1916, forty-three independent record companies had joined them (Gelatt 190).

[9] Prior to its development as a mass medium, radio had been widely used as a two-way medium by the anarchistic wireless movement in the United States as a means of circumventing the high cost of telephony. (See *Wireless Imagination* for a full account of the disposition of the early wireless movement.) Radio was also used in the context of naval communication. Ralph Engelmann notes that audio communication provided a vital component of the new imperialism of the 1890s as a period in which Puerto Rico and Hawaii were first annexed in that it permitted a vital means of communication from ship to ship (13).

[10] This mimicry between media systems resulted from the fact that while radio stars made sound recordings, radio did not broadcast sound recordings, initially because of the poor quality of acoustic era and early electrical era recordings and later because of a dispute over the payment of royalties to ASCAP which led to the founding of BMI. In the thirties, in particular, radio would evolve in a closed system that played its own pre-recorded programming.

[11] Only Edison's own technicians were capable of handling the many different problems that arose from the necessity of synchronizing the two different forms of media, and the system failed after being launched in 1913.

[12] Lauste's system was based on a method of projecting sound over a beam of light which had earlier been invented by Alexander Graham Bell and which was called the Photophone.

[13] After the War, Decca was the first record company to market full fidelity recording and reproduction. The first work to be recorded in 1946—Stravinsky's *The Fire Bird Suite*—had been scored specifically in order to prevent its mechanical reproduction.

[14] For a fuller account of the role of the OWI in domestic commercial broadcasts and domestic foreign language radio, see Gerd Horton, *Radio Goes to War: The Cultural Politics of Propaganda during World War II.*

[15] For a concise summary of the objectives of cultural radio broadcasts within the war, see Henry Cowell, "Shaping Music for Total War," in *Modern Music,* Vol. 22, Nov. 1944-June 1945 (New York: AMS Press, 1966) pp. 223-226.

[16] Although MacLeish was involved to various degrees in all of the OWI wartime radio apparatus, John Houseman, who was Orson Welles' collaborator in the Mercury Theater and other New Deal anti-fascist theater projects, was the first director of the network.

---

[17] G. Robert Vincent, "The Story of the National Voice Library and the Man Who Made It" (Roach 184). As a point of comparison, the total number of discs produced by the commercial recording industry in 1941was 127,000,000 (Gelatt 276).

[18] "Columbia's Challenge," *Newsweek*, June 28, 1948, p. 42.

[19] Second wave electronics were based on the use of gas enclosed in vacuum tubes as a means of amplifying electrical current. Third and fourth wave technologies, in contrast, were based on the use of solid state super-conductors, which were produced by the introduction of small amounts of electrically conductive material into another solid material. This allowed for simultaneous transmission of positive and negative current in a single material. The first half of the twentieth century was driven by vacuum-tube electronics, then, while the second was driven by the introduction of solid state superconductors, culminating with the development of silicon as the material medium that drove fourth wave analogue era electronics and later with the I/C silicon chip as the basis of the more familiar digital era electronics. This doping of what McLuhan calls "the extensions of man" drove the hi-fi industry in particular as the most advanced sub-field within the larger field of postwar home electronics.

[20] The economics of the voice publishing business were such that spoken word records could be produced for a fraction of what it cost to produce books. As noted in a early review of Caedmon: "To put a piece of literature on the Broadway stage, a producer must sell upwards of 100,000 tickets to pay the original investment; to the same work in print a publisher must sell about 3,000 books to cover the initial cost; but to put it on a long-playing record, the recording company need only sell 1,000 copies to break even." See Henry Hewes, "Master's Voices," *The Saturday Review*, Aug 16, 1952, pp. 26-8.

[21] Unlike Caedmon, Harvard would continue to publish educational recordings of poets of national standing throughout the 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s, including Theodore Roethke, Robinson Jeffers, Randall Jarrell, Robert Lowell and Sylvia Plath among others. Yale later joined Harvard in the early 1960s through a foundation-sponsored poetry recording initiative.

[22] In general, many of *spoken text* documents of the postwar era seem to reflect the social aging of radio in wartime in that many of the featured performers on postwar recordings—including Corwin, actors Orson Welles and Anthony Burgess and poets Millay and Sandburg—had been particularly active over the airwaves on behalf of the OWI. This was part of the social aging of radio in wartime during the postwar era.

[23] "The New Recordings," *The Saturday Review*, May 31, 1947, p. 34.

[24] "The Abbreviated Muse," *The New Yorker*, July 24, 1954, pp. 50-1.

Chapter Two
Modern Poetry, *Read Texts* and "The LP Moment"

As noted in my introduction, Caedmon was founded after Barbara Holdridge and Marianne Mantell heard Dylan Thomas read at the Poetry Center. Having determined beforehand that they might like to record him, the two spent some time preparing their plan of attack. As Holdridge recalls: "We organized a little note before we even went there." That note read:

> Dear Mr. Thomas,
>
> We have been told that there is no admission to backstage, but that you will come out after the recital to "greet" the crowd.
>
> We are interested in discussing a recording and publishing venture project with you, but find the crowd a little impractical for this. Have you some suggestion as to how we could meet?

The note was signed M. Roney and B. Cohen. According to Holdridge, they omitted their first names because they were "trying to be entrepreneurs in a man's world." She adds: "Little did we know that if we had signed our first names, he would have been much more receptive!" However, they did not immediately make contact with Thomas because the Director of the Poetry Center had intercepted their note. John Malcolm Brinnin advised them to call upon Thomas at the Chelsea Hotel. They began trying to call him. However, as Holdridge recalls: "I never, never succeeded until I made the great sacrifice of calling at four in the morning. He was just getting in from his night's carousal and actually made an appointment to meet. And he actually did remember the appointment—*because he was stuttering all over and obviously in his cups when I called*—but he did remember."

Thomas suggested lunch at the Little Shrimp Restaurant. He arrived with his wife Caitlin, who quickly ascertained that the two were not sexually predatory and left them alone to discuss business. Memories of drinking play a large role in Mantell's recollection of subsequent events. As she recalls: "I had my first martini—and also my second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh." In contrast, Holdridge's memories center on the role of wordplay in convincing the poet to record. As she recalls: "We hit it off wonderfully. He had the most wry and bawdy sense of humor. He punned—but we punned harder because we were practiced in punning. We sort of punned him under the table." Mantell, who still puns with great gusto, remembers the clincher: "Dylan reported that he was hung over and that someone had suggested that he drink of glass of beer with a raw egg in it." When Thomas remarked that he wasn't sure why this was a good remedy, she replied: "What could be more than natural than a chicken walking amidst the corn?" As Mantell notes: "At that point, he said, 'OK, I give up. What do you want?'"

Although they had persuaded Thomas to record, Holdridge and Mantell had no name in mind for their proposed recording venture. They hedged when Thomas asked, proffering that of Liveright Corporation. Arthur Pell was still tentatively interested when they first contacted Thomas but withdrew his support a short time later. Needing to sign a contract in order to secure the poet's services, Holdridge and Mantell quickly incorporated—under the name of Caedmon. Now that they had a name, they needed a contract for Thomas' services but the two couldn't afford a lawyer. According to Holdridge, the model for what later became the standard Caedmon contract "was scissored together by our first lawyer at night because we couldn't afford to pay him." As she recalls: "We watched while he literally cut parts of one contract out, and then parts of another, and scotched taped them together." Mantell remembers the construction of the Thomas contract slightly differently. As she recalls: "I wrote the contract. I wrote the exclusivity clause in my Latinate English, so that it was retroactive. Charles B. Seton checked it over." The process of drawing up this contract took place in the interval in between their first meeting with Thomas and date of the scheduled recording session of February 15.

In the interim, Holdridge and Mantell needed to secure Thomas's agent's consent. Thomas' American literary agent, Harold Ober, had recently resigned. William Morris, a theatrical agency that in Mantell's words "probably could not even spell poetry" represented Thomas. Mantell's brief discussion with Thomas' temporary agent played a pivotal in convincing the two women to forge ahead, however. As she recalls: "I went to see this guy at William Morris. This was the afternoon of the night that Caedmon came to be. I went to see this guy and whether or not we would go ahead with this whole thing depended on whether or not Cary Auerbach would allow us to have his client or not. I went and sat there and I said, 'We're starting this company.' And he said, 'Congratulations! Do you need any money?'" As Mantell recalls: "That was not just an agent not caring about his client. The whole atmosphere at the time was 'A new company! That's wonderful! Let me help you!'"

At this point, Mantell also enlisted the help of Peter Bartók. The son of the composer Béla, Bartók had originally trained for a career in electrical engineering but had become interested in recording music while at college. According to Bartók: "It was quite a lucrative business when the LP or Long Playing record was first discovered. Anybody could make a record and it would sell—some copies of it—because people had record players and not enough records to buy." Considerable technical expertise was required, however. Fortunately, the engineer and Mantell were romantically involved at the time. As Bartók recalls: "Once the idea of Caedmon was conceived, since I knew Marianne it seemed to be natural that she asked me to do the first recordings for them."

While there was no shortage of opportunities to make recordings, independent record producers faced difficulties in securing sound studios. As Holdridge remembers: "Finding studios where there were not any extraneous noises was not easy." Most commonly Bartók rented space in the Steinway building across from Carnegie Hall, which was also known as Carnegie Recital Hall B. Mantell and Holdridge remember that the hall on 113 West 57th Street had particularly good acoustics. Between them, Bartók and Mantell made the decision to book Steinway Hall for the Thomas recording and Holdridge and Mantell informed Thomas of the date of the recording session. At the appointed time and place, Bartók set up his equipment and the trio waited eagerly for the poet to arrive. However, it soon became apparent that Thomas was not going to do so. According to Mantell: "We waited and we waited. And then we made some phone calls. And somebody said, 'We put him in a cab.' Well, wherever that cab went, it did not go to Steinway Hall."[1]

Because Thomas was a no-show, the first spoken word recording that Caedmon made was of Laurence Olivier. Mantell and Holdridge secured the actor's services as a result of Mantell's friendship with Michael Sonino, a fellow graduate of the New York School of Music and Art, who also went by the name of Michael Thorne. Sonino was well connected to New York's theatrical community. Holdridge recalls that his uncle

Robert Moss "was one of the very fine second tier of English actors in New York theatre" and that his aunt Margelo Gilmore was also "an actress of some repute." Sonino was aspiring to a career as a graphic artist. This aspiration was not lost on Mantell. As she recalls: "I made a deal with him. He could be art director if he could get us Olivier." Sonino agreed and his uncle delivered the actor to Caedmon. Holdridge and Mantell had hoped to persuade the actor to record Shakespeare's sonnets but Olivier wasn't interested. However, the ardent monarchist was willing to record the funeral eulogy that he had recently given on the death of King George VI at The Little Church Around the Corner, which was favored by New York's expatriate British actors. He also agreed to participate on the condition that all proceeds were donated to charity.[2]

Olivier was scheduled to record on the February 22 federal holiday and Holdridge and Mantell determined that while they had the studio, they would also attempt to record the wayward Thomas. As Mantell recalls: "We arranged for Olivier's recording session to be followed immediately by Dylan's. And the trick was how to get this royalist Tory out before Dylan came in, because Dylan had told us a story about putting out a cigarette in the Queen's hand." Mantell didn't quite countenance the veracity of Thomas's story but she also didn't think that politics of the royalist actor and the anarchist poet would mix. Fortunately, as Bartók recalls: "Laurence Olivier made it right on the first take." Although Olivier had exited the studio in advance of Thomas's own arrival, from Bartók's point of view there were other difficulties to be overcome. In contrast to Holdridge and Mantell's account, he remembers that Steinway Hall had very poor acoustics and was in addition too small to hold all of the necessary recording equipment. As he recalls: "We recorded in a concert hall of very poor acoustics on the third floor of the Steinway building in New York, whereas my recording equipment was on the eighth floor of the Steinway building—connected by cables to the third floor. We had to communicate to the actors by intercom, or perhaps a representative of us had to be in the concert hall at the same time." If these technical conditions were less than ideal, Thomas like Olivier proved to be a professional. As Bartók notes: "His eloquence and the way he spoke was hard to match. It was unique."

The recording session ran aground when it was determined that Thomas had not brought enough material with him to make a full hour-long record, however. Thomas had already read the poems that he had selected including "In the White Giant's Thigh," "Fern Hill," "Do Not Go Gentle into That Good Night," "Ballad of the Long-legged Bait" and "Ceremony after a Fire Raid." These alone weren't enough material to make an LP. As Holdridge recalls: "We said, 'Think of something else.' Dylan thought and said, 'Well, there's a story I wrote about Christmas.' We said, 'Where can we get it?" And he said, *"Mademoiselle*."[3] Holdridge was dispatched to obtain a copy of the story but the magazine's offices were closed because the recording date fell on the Washington holiday. Luckily, she found someone on the premises. As Holdridge notes: "We got their only file copy. If it had not been for the one file copy—who knows what would have happened with that story?"

Holdridge had already sprinted over to the Gotham Book Mart in order to obtain copies of Thomas' poems. Thomas hadn't thought to bring any with him because he had performed his poems so frequently. As Holdridge recalls: "He didn't have books and we didn't have books." As she remembers: "I recall going to the Gotham Book Mart at the last minute and getting books from Frances Steloff. And that turned out to be important in a way." Not only was Steloff was the only bookseller in New York who kept Thomas's slim volumes of poetry in stock, her expertise as a bookseller would turn out to be a determining factor in the fate of the record label. At the time that Holdridge and Mantell recorded Thomas, they were operating under the assumption that Liveright Corporation was interested in distributing Caedmon recordings if not actually publishing them and Liveright was still tentatively involved when Caedmon undertook the very first recording session. As Holdridge recalls: "The sales manager of Liveright came with us to the recording session. Jimmy Collins, his name was. He was a friend. We were buddies although he was much older . . . . He was unimpressed with what he saw. What he saw was a bunch of kids. He saw us and a lot of boys and girls—you know, friends and hangers-on—who came along and giggled and who were generally lively. And he thought to himself, 'This is not business-like.' Then he called Frances Steloff of the Gotham Book Mart, and said, 'How much does this Dylan Thomas sell?' Frances said, 'Well, we sell maybe five books a year.' And Jimmy was out. He told Arthur Pell, who was the head of the company, not to touch it, and he didn't."[4]

Holdridge and Mantell began to approach other print publishers as a result. After a few rejections, they decided that Hiram Hayden of Crown—who was also the editor of the Phi Beta Kappa journal *The American Scholar*—was the most likely candidate to back the project. As Holdridge recalls: "At that point, we said, 'If Hiram Hayden at Crown says no, we'll do it ourselves.' Well, we went up the elevator to Hiram Hayden's office and he was out to lunch. And that's the beginning of Caedmon—Hiram Hayden being out to lunch." Holdridge and Mantell don't seem to have dithered excessively long before determining to go into business, however. Caedmon Publishers opened its doors for business on March 1—a mere week after the Olivier and Thomas recordings were made—using a sixteen hundred dollar stake that they had amassed between them.

The first recordings were pressed quickly. The Olivier records were ready in early April. As Bartok recalls: "He [Olivier] was so sure of himself, and his presentation so perfect from his experience that very little needed to be done." Bartók remembers that he was momentarily embarrassed when the knighted actor came around to approve the edited master tape because he'd casually labeled the tapes "Larry, Tape One" and "Larry, Tape Two." However, this informality was typical of the Caedmon atmosphere and apparently no offense was taken.[5] Holdridge and Mantell decided to press the Olivier recording in both 78-*rpm* and 33 and 1/3-*rpm* formats. As Holdridge recalls: "LPs were just coming in at that time. We were so unsure of the market that we ended up putting one of the two recordings, the Laurence Olivier, on 78 as well as LP, which was smart as it turned out because the old Brits hadn't converted and it was an old Brit kind of market." The Olivier recordings were marketed toward the British acting aristocracy in New York and secondarily to American anglophiles including groups as the St. George Society. This was the beginning of a heavy promotion of the record. Two months later, Mantell also wrote to the head of the Actor's Fund of America in order to suggest that leaflets about the recording be slipped into copies of *Playbill.* With typical boldness, she had already taken an even more ambitious tack by sending a copy to the new British monarch, Queen Elizabeth II.[6]

With the arrival of the Thomas records, the Caedmon enterprise proceeded to get off the ground commercially. Mantell's expertise was of enormous importance in this respect. As she recalls: "I knew a lot of people in the music business. I had the connections to get recordings made, to get the covers produced, to get the covers manufactured, to set up distributors." Once they had inventory, Caedmon's founders began selling the records over the phone to Manhattan area bookstores and record stores. Holdridge was particularly adept at making the first sales. As Mantell recalls: "Barbara was very good at that. She was better at cold calls and selling than I. Her father was a salesman, maybe she got it from him." As Holdridge recalls: "I remember sitting on a chair when we first started in our really bare office with a telephone on one chair and a telephone directory on the other. I called the bookstores and said: 'We have a recording of Dylan Thomas. By the way, would you take a couple of Laurence Olivier?' For the music stores, I said just the opposite. 'We have Laurence Olivier, but we also have Dylan Thomas.' So they would take three of one and two of the other."

At this juncture, Holdridge and Mantell also began a letter-writing campaign in order to persuade other poets and authors to record. Holdridge recalls that they made a list of "each of the people we admired." Both women remember that there was little argument between them about who should be on this list. As Holdridge frames Caedmon's editorial principle: "These were the people whom we had read and whose work had timeless qualities." As she recalls: "There was a definite progression and development. We knew our American literature and our British literature. It was primarily American literature that we concentrated on . . . . Thomas Mann was at the top because Marianne had a contact. And Katherine Anne Porter and Eudora Welty, MacLeish and cummings." There was very little disagreement between them. As Mantell recalls: "We had between the two of us an extraordinary sense of purpose [about] who was worth recording."

Holdridge and Mantell initially appealed to poets and authors directly, either in writing or by telephone. One of Caedmon's earliest letters from Holdridge to Katherine Anne Porter—which is dated April 24 1952—gives some idea of the overall tenor of these early appeals. Its opening paragraphs read as follows:

> Dear Miss Porter:
>
> We have recently begun producing a series of recordings by contemporary authors, reading selections for their works. Our list already

> includes Dylan Thomas and Thomas Mann, and we would very much like to have a recording by you as well.
>
> Hearing literature, we think, is important. A sizeable amount of contemporary writing has atrophied, simply because so many authors have lost sight—and sound—of their material. There is a growing preoccupation with margins and punctuation that seems to us unhealthy, and we feel that a series of recordings such as ours may do a little to reverse this tendency.
>
> These are not just recordings of Great Voices. They try to indicate something of what the author intends; in other words, to get down to essential business. We would of course like you to make the final choice of what you will read . . . . In the matter of quantity, length of selections and so on, we can certainly be of some help, and can work together with you on choice as well.
>
> Long-playing records such as these can take from forty-five to fifty-five minutes. The recording itself would be fairly simple, and could be done in New York, perhaps in the next few weeks. Since records are made first on tapes being transferred to discs, you would be able to edit as much as you pleased before giving your final approval. Four weeks after that the record would be in the bookstores.

Holdridge's letter concluded by outlining Caedmon's terms, which were royalties of ten percent of the American retail price of $4.95 and a three hundred dollar advance, to be paid upon completion of the recording session. These were satisfactory to Porter, who was recorded reading *The Downward Path to Wisdom* in Paris in June by a volunteer whose name Caedmon's founders have forgotten. Porter also recorded *Pale Horse, Pale Rider* for Caedmon in New York in December of that year.

Letters to poets and authors generally outlined the terms of remuneration and the nature of the recording process. They pointed out the ease and speed with which recordings could be made and promised writers editorial control over their performances. As the above letter indicates, they also stressed an overall shift from a culture of reading to a culture of listening by explicitly framing "hearing literature" as a supplement to writing and by implicitly threatening writers with 'atrophy' in the new media ecology. These appeals indirectly alluded to the fact that a certain kind of fetishizing of typography in modern literature was somewhat "unhealthy" but they also resisted the rhetoric of "Great Voices" that generally underwrote the deployment of full sound spectrum voice playback media. Holdridge's appeal to Porter seems to have served as a template for letters to other poets and authors. Mantell's letter to Marianne Moore, dated one month later, reads very similarly. Moore took considerably more persuading, however.

Caedmon also contacted Ernest Hemingway by letter and telephone during the first few months of the young enterprise. However, correspondence between Hemingway and Holdridge indicates that that Hemingway perceived Holdridge's opening gambits as "high-pressure salesmanship" and that he responded very aggressively in kind. Writing to Holdridge on July 20, Hemingway related that he had originally under the impression when listening to her over the telephone that she represented "some Government agency" but stood corrected as the result of receiving her recent letter.[7] He then peppered her with a series of questions about the stature of the Caedmon enterprise including: "How many books has Caedmon published? Who are the officers and directors of the firm? What references can you give me?" Hemingway elaborated on his violent antipathy to the idea of being edited and his concerns about the Caedmon's level of distribution. He also insisted that he would need to retain copyright in terms of his own spoken performances. Finally, Hemingway approached the issue of remuneration by noting: "If I were convinced that you had maximum distribution facilities and could give proper guarantees my terms for making a sixty minute recording such as you suggest would be an advance of $5000 (five thousand dollars) and a royalty of 15% on the retail price of the records or records to be paid semi-annually." Aggressively concluding his letter with a handwritten postscript, Hemingway queried: "Do you have any idea of the value of the property you are negotiating for?"

This series of early letters indicates different degrees of receptiveness to the idea of spoken word publishing. Indeed, it would turn out that mediators between Caedmon and the poets and authors they wanted to record were almost always needed. Caedmon's 'angels' would come in many different forms. Thomas Mann, the next writer to record for Caedmon, was reached though the intervention of Dr. Anna Jacobsen, who was the Head of the German Department at Hunter College.[8] Mantell also wrote the author in order to appeal to him directly. Mann promptly agreed to her request and she flew to Santa Monica in order to record him. Like Porter, Mann was an important figure in the anti-fascist ideological mobilization of writers and other cultural figures that occurred during wartime. His allegorical novel, *Dr. Faustus,* which was published during the war, historicized the cultural life of Germany in the late nineteenth and early-twentieth century and offered an important critique of the ineffectiveness of the bourgeois German intelligentsia of the Weimar period in preventing Hitler's rise to power; it was also in many ways a scathing indictment of modernist experimentalism. On several different levels, then, the inclusion of the exiled German writer and self-described militant humanist in the Caedmon catalogue seems to have represented a kind of memorialization of the fight against fascism and the political unconscious of the LP medium.[9]

As preliminary to the recording session, Mantell remembers having a formal lunch with the writer at his home that was also attended by the author's wife Katia and his daughter Erica. Fifty years later, Mantell remembers vividly remembers that event. In order to convince the writer that she was sufficiently "intellectually competent" to determine what he should record, the outspoken twenty-two year old inadvertently entered into an argument with him. As Mantell recalls: "Mann sat to my right. As part of the business of [demonstrating] I'm not just some idiot, I *do* know something, we got into a conversation about a German writer, a playwright of the nineteenth century. And Mann said, 'Oh, he's such a great writer.' And I said, 'My God, this guy is not a dramatist at all. He has Sappho get on stage and beat her breast and say, "I'm so unhappy" . . . and then she jumps off a cliff.' And I went into this whole thing about T.S. Eliot and the objective correlative. And I'm twenty-three and Mann is sitting next to me, fifty years my senior and more. And Mann says, 'Ah, but he has *style*.' And I said, 'What about *content*?' And he said, 'Well, my dear, you will come to understand that *style* is all there is.'" This comment by Mann seems made a deep impression on Mantell. Resonating for years afterwards, it would have a profound impact on her conception of the nature of the Caedmon recording enterprise. Style became the criterion of determining whom to record—particularly as this related to recordings of authors reading fiction.

The trip was also memorable because it introduced Mantell to the pragmatics of negotiating with writers about which works they would record. As Mantell elaborates: "I wanted him to record things that he had written a long time before that. This was the first time but by no means the last of convincing the author, whoever it was, that I was sufficiently sympathetic to whom they *were* that they could let me pick." As she notes: "Almost invariably, if the first works are not immature, they turn out to be pretty much the best things ever turned out." Holdridge concurs: "In many cases, the poet's most recent work was what he considered his best but we wouldn't necessarily agree." In this respect, Caedmon was working against the interests of writers and print publishers, who tended to see recordings as publicity. In this case, Mantell's will prevailed. Mann was recorded reading two of his short stories and selections from an early novel, *Tonio Kroger*. Perhaps because it was recorded in German, the Mann record was not profitable in economic terms. Mantell hazards that the recording sold about four hundred copies. The primary value of the recording was not financial, however. As Mantell explains the principles at work in undertaking the first recordings: "You're doing a number of things. You're building a catalogue. You're reinforcing your existence with your distributors. You're adding a name to the letter that you will write to the next [author] and it was a meaningful name at the time. So it's not, well, it cost six hundred dollars to fly there—or whatever it cost. That's not how to do the arithmetic!"[10]

Tennessee Williams was the next writer to be recorded. Holdridge and Mantell reached the playwright not by writing or calling him cold but through the mediating influence of Audrey Wood, a major theatrical agent who had helped to forge Williams' career as a playwright. Bartók recorded Williams on June 6 at Steinway Hall. The recording session was memorable because it involved the first case in which the technical nature of sound recording process clearly intimidated a writer. In the course of preparing to record, Bartók had somewhat sternly cautioned Williams not to get too close to the microphone and as a result Williams was a "nervous wreck" for the rest of the recording session according to Mantell. Williams' Caedmon recording featured the playwright reading the opening monologue and the last scene from *The Glass Menagerie,* along with several of his poems. Perhaps because of his nervousness, Caedmon supplemented the material from the recording session with a tape of Williams reading his short story *The Yellow Bird*, which was provided by James Laughlin.

Archibald MacLeish was also recorded during the summer of 1952. Mantell maintains that she was unaware of MacLeish's project to preserve the voices of American poets on record while serving as Librarian of Congress. She suggests that they chose to record him purely on the basis of the merits of his poetry. As she recalls: "There was warmth there on my part. A few poems of his I had read and loved in college. I was much drawn to his work." However, in contrast to this account the liner notes on the MacLeish record suggest that Caedmon chose to record him because he was first and foremost "a responsible humanist."[11] MacLeish's derivative poetry, which imitated the content or themes but not the style of the literary modernists, was for the most part not very highly valued on aesthetic terms even in its own historical context. Indeed, particularly pretentious works such as *The Hamlet of A. MacLeish* were much satirized. However, MacLeish's overtly polemical poems of the late 1930s and early 1940s, which were read by many as outright propaganda, also performed cultural pluralism as few other poets had done before him. These poems staked out a distinctly liberal humanist position that was in keeping with the wider political morality of the wartime and postwar era, and were central to the neo-humanist counter-formation to literary modernism that began to occur in the 1930s. Like the work of another highly derivative "modernist," Edith Sitwell, MacLeish's poems attacked the reactionary and even racist disposition of the works of many of the more formally accomplished modernists and were part of a wider discursive matrix that surrounded the social aging of modern poetry in the 1930s and early 1940s.

MacLeish instantly agreed to record. Bartók generally declined to undertake recording sessions outside the New York area, so the two women of Caedmon cadged a midnight ride to MacLeish's farm in Conway, Massachusetts from a young poet from Hoboken named Armand Petracca, who was incidentally a friend of Ezra Pound's. Upon walking into MacLeish's home, the very first thing they when they saw on the wall was a framed letter from Franklin Roosevelt commending the poet's work during the war. They took to MacLeish instantly. According to Mantell: "He was the nicest, sweetest, kindest, dearest guy. He was a genuinely decent person." MacLeish's recording to be undertaken at a poet's own home. As long as these were free of extraneous noises, these locations were ideal for recording. Holdridge and Mantell didn't have the temerity to suggest what MacLeish should record and as a result, he was one of the few permitted to make his own selections.

Like Mantell, Holdridge vigorously defends their choice to record MacLeish. As she notes: "He was very active in the arts community. He was extremely well known. And he was still writing." However, Holdridge also concedes that MacLeish was useful because he facilitated introductions to other poets and writers: "MacLeish was instrumental in the first year or two. MacLeish directed us to cummings and was instrumental in us recording Pound." Mantell also recalls that MacLeish was an important figure in the early recording history. She recalls that Caedmon "may have used his name" in order to get in touch with Porter, for example. However, Mantell suggests that invoking MacLeish's name was a mixed blessing given that many of the poets whom they later approached often had a violent antipathy to MacLeish.

In general, the Caedmon venture snowballed as the result of some good connections. As a result, the Caedmon list began to take on a life of its own. As Holdridge recalls: "We got referrals from one to the others. That was how that [the list] developed." Thomas was the most important of these connections. As Mantell acknowledges: "Dylan introduced us to a lot of people in the Village whom we hadn't known before. Lloyd Frankenberg and his wife Lauren MacIvor, Howard Moss the would-be poet, Louis MacNeice and his wife. You know, major people, minor people. Ruthven Todd and his wife . . . . People introduce you to people. Through Dylan, we knew people—once we did Dylan." Dylan Thomas' print publisher James Laughlin was one of the most important of these connections. Laughlin offered to distribute Caedmon product without taking a commission. This arrangement promoted the firm's list as many of the writers that Caedmon first recorded were also New Directions authors. (Bob MacGregor, the General Manager at New Directions, whom Holdridge and Mantell met through Thomas, also personally wrote to each of the freelance sales representatives that distributed New Directions books in order to tell them about the Caedmon catalogue.)

The struggling spoken word publishing ventured needed all the help it could get at this juncture when Holdridge and Mantell undertook every single element of the young enterprise. Aside from making the recordings and overseeing record production, this included negotiating with authors and their agents, writing contracts, financing the company, maintaining business correspondence, getting and billing sales, collecting invoices, and generating their own publicity. As Mantell recounts: "It was a tremendous workload. Boy, I worked! Not just intellectually but physically!" Aside from tape and record mastering, the only function that Holdridge and Mantell were initially unable to perform was that of accounting. However, they soon learned the basic rudiments of the profession when Ernest Sommer—who was a friend of Holdridge's father and the first of Caedmon's highly idiosyncratic accountants—taught them how to do the books.

Neither of Caedmon's founders expected to get rich and both women were still living at home. Still, finances were sufficiently straightened that both found it necessary to work part-time. (Mantell taught English at a yeshiva school in Brooklyn while Holdridge worked as a both an editor for a small vanity press and as a sales assistant at a bridal salon.) During this period, Holdridge and Mantell often borrowed small sums of money from their families in order to keep Caedmon afloat. Bartók was also a major creditor. The two drew no income at all in the first year. However, by the middle of the second year, they each began to draw what Holdridge later characterized as "a very small salary . . . [of] something like between $60 and $80 a week."[12]

Still, money was so tight that to save on local shipping costs the two made local deliveries using a red wheelbarrow that Bartók had modified for this purpose. The two young women simply filled the wheelbarrow to capacity with inventory and then waited for gallant male New Yorkers to it up and down from street curbs all over the Manhattan area. The wheelbarrow was nicknamed "Mattiwilda" after a well-known opera singer. Their Magnecorder "Maggie" formed the fourth element in the all-female business. These nicknames reveal the youth and informality of the early Caedmon business culture. As Holdridge remembers: "We were young and gay in the old sense. It was fun. They were good times."

In general, the elements of chance and intuition seem to have driven Holdridge and Mantell's approach to the "game" of record publishing. If they were uncertain of how to make a certain decision they were not above overturning a snow globe and reading it for a sign, for example. Joke correspondence with the many people who wrote the company—sometimes signed "Bill Caedmon"—was another favorite pastime. Despite this gaiety, the Caedmon business culture was slowly taking shape. Holdridge and Mantell would later pride themselves on having a corporate structure that was explicitly non-hierarchical. All decisions, no matter how small, required a consensus. As Mantell notes: "There was no division of labor because most of what we did was scut work." Each partner subsequently developed particular forms of expertise, however. Mantell began to take an active role in sound recording. Holdridge seems to have taken on a stronger role in the day-to-day business of running the record company. She also supervised most of the visual design of LP covers.[13]

Record sales slowly began to gain momentum over the summer and fall months of 1952. As Mantell recalls: "We know that a little movement began very early on. There was a high school in Lake Forest Illinois that bought a copy of Dylan Thomas. Then the same purchaser moved to another school in Lake Forest, Illinois. Then one college in Lake Forest bought the record. Then the public library bought it. Who knows the reason for this? Maybe the teacher had the librarian over for dinner? . . . . But these little ripples grew." One major milestone was a late 1952 review by Harvey Breit, in *The New York Times*, which was the first to mention the Thomas recording in print. Sales of the Thomas record began to take off after this. Not only did individuals begin to inquire about the recording, teachers began to order it directly from Caedmon. This was particularly important because although Holdridge and Mantell sensed that schools might be interested in their records they had no way of targeting them as they couldn't afford direct mail.

Caedmon made a number of recordings in the last few months of 1952, including one of Eudora Welty. As Mantell recalls: "We believed—more than that we *knew*—that whether she wrote another story or not, that this was a major force in American fiction." Welty was recorded in October reading three of her stories, including "Why I Live at the P.O." Bartók also recorded Sean O'Casey for Caedmon in November. The inclusion of Casey in the Caedmon catalogue represented an emphasis on literature written for the ear rather than the eye. As the liner notes observed: "More truly than any playwright, with the exception of Shakespeare and the Greeks, he writes language whose vigor, whose very meaning, is in the hearing." Like the legendarily uneducable Thomas, the former railway and dockworker had followed a process of educating himself by declaiming the works of others by heart. Caedmon's first *spoken text* recording of historical literature was also released in the form of a record that featured Sonino's uncle, Robert Moss, performing Chaucer's "The Parsons Tale" and "The Nun's Priest's Tale."

Simultaneously, the Caedmon project began to coalesce more narrowly around the legacy of modern writing. Many of those that Caedmon recorded around this time were prominently associated with the Modern Library in particular, including e. e. cummings. The poet had been one of the first names on the Caedmon list. However, it took Caedmon some time make contact with the him because of the difficulty in getting past the poet's wife Marion, whom both of Caedmon's founders categorize as a "dragon." "Dragons" were figures that stood between Caedmon and the poets they wanted to record. As Mantell recalls: "We had dragons of various kinds. If we could get to a person, it was never a problem." Not all writers' protective dragons were wives, yet wives had an extra interest to defend. According to Holdridge: "Every poet's wife had to turn into a dragon to keep the wide-eyed populace at bay and she [Marion Cummings] was a good one." Both women recall that MacLeish was vital in swaying the reluctant poet. Mantell also recalls that Cummings' agent—Bernice Baumgartner—also helped to persuade him.

Cummings was recorded at Steinway Hall in May of 1953 reading "dying is fine)but Death," "I thank You God for this most amazing" and "sweet spring is your etcetera" among other works. Holdridge and Mantell both recall that the poet made a point of commending them on their recording technique afterwards. As Mantell recalls: "When the session was finished he said, 'That was easy. I felt I was talking to you—and not the machine.'" Holdridge remembers these words more poetically. As she recalls, Cummings, who had been recorded several times before, said: "It's wonderful to have a pair of ears at the other end." Caedmon never recorded Cummings again. However, ironically the company—and Mantell in particular—went on to have an enduring relationship with his widow Marion. Not atypically for the straight-shooting Mantell, that relationship was initiated over an argument. Shortly after Cummings' was recorded, Marion sent the company a nasty note about exploiting poets. At this stage of the Caedmon enterprise, Mantell was still relatively naïve about the characteristically antagonistic relationship between writers and publishers, and she was incensed about the letter's tone. As Mantell recalls: "So I called her back and said, 'If I had any idea that I was going to get this attitude, I wouldn't have bothered!'" Much to Mantell's surprise, Marion Cummings called back to apologize. Fom that point forward, Caedmon affected a truce with cummings' "dragon."[14]

Most poets and writers have designated "dragons" that they refer to as agents. Company correspondence indicates that during the first months of 1953 Holdridge and Mantell began to develop skills in negotiating with these as cold calls and cold letters to writers were slowly replaced with direct negotiations with their agents. As Holdridge recalls: "In those days, author rights—subsidiary rights for recordings—were not in existence. It [a writer's royalty] was just a little extra manna from heaven." As outlined by Holdridge, the terms of the "standard" Caedmon contract as follows: "We paid an advance of $300 and a royalty of 10% and that was it. We didn't negotiate it." While the economic terms of the standard Caedmon contract would turn out to be only very occasionally variable, the non-financial terms of individual contracts varied considerably. Contracts between writers and voice publishers such as Caedmon were arrived at on a case-by-case basis. Writers sometimes took a direct hand in these negotiations. Poets who were anxious to record—such as Louis MacNeice, who despite his eagerness to make his own LP was only recorded on the *Caedmon Treasury*—signed away the rights to their own performances *carte blanche*. At the other end of the spectrum, Ezra Pound supervised a complex contract that was worthy of the finest copyright lawyer. Literary agents negotiated the space between these two extremes.

One of these, Mrs. Byrne of the Madison Avenue literary agency Curtis Brown, represented two very different poets who were recorded by Caedmon in 1953—Ogden Nash and W.H. Auden. The first of these writers, the popular poet Nash, might seem to have been an odd name to add to Caedmon's catalogue. Mantell notes that Nash represented a "moving down" and an attempt by Caedmon to cater to what she terms "a seventh-grade market." However, Nash was also one of the most popular names on Modern Library list as published by Random House. Certainly, direct correspondence sent by Mantell to Nash outlining the list of poems that she was hoping he might be willing to record suggests that the Modern Library connection was an important one. As

Mantell noted of her choices: “They represent a very rock-bottom selection, and nothing later than the Modern Library collection, since I cannot find anything later and have not had the time to go to a store or library.”[15] As if to mollify her neglect of the poet’s more recent work, Mantell also added: “The list of poems I have made must be added to, and can certainly be argued with.” She then added: “I am trying to arrange joint publicity with Little, Brown for your new book and the record—which means the record has to be out before April 7, and the recording should be made soon. Any time between February 25 and March 6, excepting March 4 and 5, would be all right for us . . . any hour of the night or day will do. The whole business should not take more than three or four hours.”

Generally, Caedmon’s appeals to poets and authors outlined the convenience and informality of the atmosphere involved in the recording session itself. Underscoring this informality in her letter to Nash, Mantell added: “I think that you should know that our authors almost never have any idea of what they are going to read before they get to the session; that we always provide the author’s favorite brand of whiskey; and that everything always turns out wonderfully.” Nash appears to have been satisfied with these terms. He was recorded on the very first day suggested by Mantell. He also recorded each of the works she selected along with a few of his own choosing. A generally informal atmosphere seems to have prevailed at this particular recording session. Later correspondence with Nash indicates that he was the first writer who was asked to help to haul equipment to the venue that Caedmon used as a temporary sound recording studio.[16] Presumably, Nash was also satisfied with the overall experience of recording because like many Caedmon writers, he chose to re-record for the company in subsequent years.[17]

During the same period that Caedmon was negotiating to record Nash, the label also approached W.H. Auden. The poet’s star was particularly high that spring. Not only had Auden recently published several books of poetry, his collaboration with the composer Igor Stravinsky, which was based on Hogarth’s *The Rake’s Progress*, was about to be mounted on the New York stage. Once again, Caedmon approached Auden through the mediating offices of Byrne and directly. Mantell’s appeals to Auden were considerably different than those she had advanced to Nash. Her letter to the poet began by noting: “By the time you get this you will be more relaxed because *The Rake* will have had a wonderful performance and been greeted by rave reviews, and I will be more tired, from having stood for it all."[18] In addition to complimenting the poet profusely, Mantell clearly ceded editorial control, granting: "The final selection of material anyway is yours." She closed by reminding Auden that they had already announced the recording in *Publisher's Weekly* and were already taking orders although it was apparent the recording date for Auden was at best uncertain. Caedmon correspondence reveals that Auden's agents—including Mr. Collins who was the head of Curtis Brown and Byrne herself—had clearly agreed to the principle of making a recording but that Auden was resistant to the idea.

The poet avoided several proposed recording session dates before sound engineer Bob Blake successfully recorded him on December 6 at Steinway Hall. Auden maintained editorial control over the works he recorded. He chose "In Memory of W.B. Yeats" and several of his most recent poems including "The Capital," "As He Is," "School Children" and "Precious Five." These series of poems formed the record's A-Side. *Buccolics,* Auden's most recently published pastoral poem series, formed the record's B-side. However, in general this recording session was one of the least amenable that Caedmon ever undertook because Auden coolly rejected the intimacy that Holdridge and Mantell worked to cultivate with writers. As Mantell recalls: "There was no personal thing at all—zip. Auden thought he was if not a god, a demi-god."

Perhaps because Auden was hostile to the typical intimacy of a Caedmon recording session, Mantell doesn't remember the details of his performance. However, she does remember him fastidiously combing his hair for the benefit of the *Mademoiselle* photographer who dropped in as part of an article about the recording session. The vision of the formerly socialist poet performing his work at a Carnegie Hall sound studio with a reporter and photographer from *Mademoiselle* magazine in attendance offers a kind of "snapshot" of what Raymond Williams called "the second face of Modernism," which reflects the social aging of literary modernism through the 1930s, 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s. It is easy to laugh at this image. However, "the Mademoiselle channel" also published original work by Thomas and Porter and undoubtedly deserves a certain place with respect to the conditions of the literary marketplace in the early fifties. Much like the Caedmon venture, *Mademoiselle* played a role in popularizing "modernism" and the "humanities" in popular media during the postwar era.

Publicity was always a key aspect of the Caedmon venture and Holdridge and Mantell were more than willing to participate in stories about Caedmon on the grounds that publicity was cheap while advertising was expensive. The subsequent article about the recording session didn't focus on the Auden but on the young women of Caedmon. Written by fiction editor Leo Lehman and entitled "The Monsters," it profiled Holdridge and Mantell as female record company owners whose nickname, Lehmann assured *Mademoiselle* readers, was derived from the "quiet, blithe superiority with which they manage their temperamental business." The article was full of photos Holdridge and Mantell posing in their cluttered office, visiting a record pressing plant, displaying record jackets, packing records into crates and distributing records by hand. It offered *Mademoiselle's* readers a different vision of young American womanhood—that of brainy entrepreneurs of postwar publishing. Mantell treasured the article for a different reason, however. She had been turned down entrance to the prestigious Bernard College as an aspiring Physics major although she had a 98% high school average and had finished high school six months early. The rejection had been phrased in explicitly anti-Semitic grounds.[19] Mantell recalls that after Lehman mentioned this in his article, Bernard issued a press release stating that they no longer followed the practice of restricting admission to Jewish students on the basis of admissions quotas.

Earlier in the year, Caedmon had recorded another figure that generated a lot of publicity for the company in the form of Osbert Sitwell. The poet had played a significant role in the history of poetry in wartime by organizing poetry readings during the Blitz bombing. Bryher later recalled that the idea to organize a poetry reading "to keep the arts alive" and to raise low morale had originally been Sir Osbert's (Pearson 358-9). The first of these, the much-photographed Royal Poetry Reading, took place at the Aeolian Hall on April 8 1943 and included performances by Osbert and Edith Sitwell, Vita Sackville-West, Walter de la Mare, T.S. Eliot and others. To some extent, Sitwell's inclusion in the vinyl archive seems to have represented the ongoing project of memorializing of the role of poetry in wartime as part of the political unconscious of the LP medium. Although Sitwell's verse is all but unreadable now and must clearly be identified with the decadent wartime aesthetic so reviled by Raymond Williams, his use of language also had a social dimension that contributed to the popularity of his verse in wartime.[20]

However, Caedmon did not elect to record Osbert on the merits of his own poetry but rather as part of an extended process of trying to lure his much more popular sister Edith into the recording studio. At the time, Edith was in Hollywood, where she was working on a film treatment of her book *Fanfare for Elizabeth* for George Cukor. She was willing to record for Caedmon on the condition that the label recorded her brothers Osbert and Sacherevell. Like her protégé, Dylan Thomas, Edith Sitwell was represented by William Morris. As Mantell recalls, "William Morris got us a package" that involved recording all three of the Sitwells. While Caedmon dutifully recorded Sacherevell, and subsequently let that recording lapse from their catalogue, the record label had considerably more interest in recording Osbert because in the process of negotiating for his services, Holdridge and Mantell became aware that he was looking for an American print publisher for his most recent book of poetry.

According to Holdridge: "We were told at William Morris that if we wanted Osbert Sitwell's book *Wrack at Tidesend* we could have it because he didn't have an American publisher. So we read it, and liked it. Also, of course, he was a Sitwell, and that meant a lot, and he would give us entrée to Edith." Caedmon's founders also relished the opportunity to enter the field of print publishing, which had been part of the original conception of Caedmon. As Mantell recalls, "The original idea was the recording would finance publishing. The purpose was to make enough money by recording poets to be able to publish them." The plan appealed to Holdridge in particular. As she recalls: "I wanted to say in the publishing business, which I loved."

The subsequent profile of Caedmon's Steinway Hall recording session with Sitwell in *The New Yorker* offered a very clear portrait of what many of the early Caedmon recording sessions were like. It began with a verbal snapshot of Mantell as the "girl in a sweater and skirt" who was sitting at the sound controls and listening to Sir Osbert's voice on the headphones "in a small anteroom containing many coils of wire, [and] a table covered with tape-recording equipment." The bespectacled Holdridge was encountered inside the recording studio where she approvingly gave Sir Osbert feedback about his reading.[21] For his part, Sir Osbert took the opportunity to remind *The New Yorker*'s audience that Americans were generally at the forefront of experiments in publishing, waggishly suggesting that he was serving as a "guinea pig" for "the "Book of Week" Club.

As this sketch reveals, Mantell was the partner who generally undertook hands-on sound engineering. Mantell had first observed Bartók making tape masters when both worked as freelancers for classical recording companies. One night while listening to a recording of some Offenbach they realized that high note was flat—so they manually stretched the tape until the note "sounded right," as she recalls. Mantell also watched as Bartók solved another problem—that of tape sticking during playback at the points where it had been edited or spliced together—by using a toothbrush to lightly dust the splices with baby powder. On another occasion, when Bartók wanted an echo effect but did not have access to an echo chamber, he piped sound through child's Slinky toy to achieve the same effect. It was this "nickel and diming" of the sound production process that stuck with Mantell. As she recalls: "What I learned from Peter is that you don't need millions of dollars of equipment. We used paper—tape, Scotch tape—and our hands to do things." This nickel and diming was a vital part of the survival of small record companies. It was necessary as only about one percent of these labels survived. As Mantell notes: "A lot of companies sprang up like mushrooms after the rain when the LP came into existence but there's a big difference between making a record or two and having a catalogue."

First year record sales averaged between three and five thousand for each recording. On paper, these were far in excess of the amount required to break even. However, at this juncture the costs of establishing the record company and maintaining inventory far outweighed the amount recordings brought in return. By October of 1952, when Caedmon first explored the possibility of obtaining a business loan, the total assets of the company were over ten thousand dollars. Less than a fifth of this amount consisted of Accounts Receivable. Caedmon had already done the numbers. It appeared that producing some fifteen to twenty records a year would be required in order to balance the books yet it was impossible to generate enough incoming cash to finance this production schedule.

The financial situation throughout 1952 and the first half of 1953 remained precarious. Two of the talents of most use to Caedmon during this period were Mantell's head for numbers and her legalistic bend of mind. Very early on, Holdridge and Mantell determined that an exemption from federal excise tax would be highly desirable in terms of the bottom line. As Mantell recalls: "The excise tax was executed on recordings as luxury goods. It was 10% of the selling price, paid by the producer of the product, actually the organization that had caused the product to be made." Sales to educational institutions were exempt from tax, providing that institutions filed for exemptions. Under this scheme, Caedmon might be eligible for relief from the excise tax but only if the institution buying the records, which did not itself benefit from that exemption, filed for that relief. Mantell decided to argue with the Department in charge of the excise tax by advancing the idea that Caedmon might be entitled to an overall exemption on the grounds that the entire Caedmon enterprise was devoted to educational recording. Against the odds, Caedmon was allowed a blanket exemption until late 1955 or early 1956—saving the company ten percent on its gross sales. An excise tax agent subsequently corrected this error. As Mantell notes with satisfaction: "We bought ourselves four years."

Caedmon also returned to Dylan Thomas in 1953. Thomas returned to America for a short tour that lasted from late April to early June. However, the reunion between Thomas and Caedmon's two founders was muted. As Holdridge remembers: "One of the things that has hurt me ever since is when he came back after the first tour. He said, 'You never wrote me at all while I was away.' And we hadn't. We had not kept in touch. And he felt that. But the fact that he felt that we had let him down—of course, he hadn't written to us either!" Holdridge and Mantell's rejoinder that they had carefully stored Thomas' raincoat in his absence apparently did not mollify the poet, who nonetheless agreed to re-record for them all the same. Thomas chose to record only poetry including "Lament," "Should Lanterns Shine," "There Was a Savior," "A Refusal to Mourn the Death, by Fire, of a Child in London," "If I Were Tickled by the Rub of Love," "And Death Shall Have no Dominion," "A Winter's Tale" and "Poem on his Birthday."

Neither Holdridge nor Mantell have shared with me the specifics of their second session with Thomas. However, the events that occurred at this recording session are a part of the public record. Drawing on interviews with Holdridge and Mantell, Thomas' biographer Paul Ferris has described the recording session as follows:

> Barbara Holdridge and Marianne Mantell were alarmed at his [Thomas's] appearance when they saw him for a second recording session. They collected him from the Chelsea in the evening. He was leaving for London the next day. His features were bloated. Besides the arm in a sling, there was a cut over his eye, and his suit was smeared with what looked like vomit. He explained the broken arm with a garbled story about an incident involving a sailor. In the studio he was morose, staring into space. (292)

Holdridge and Mantell have also continuously revisited that scene on the liner notes of posthumously published albums. The liner notes to *Dylan Thomas Volume II* described that last recording session, noting: "Dylan worked terribly hard at his reading on this tape. It was no easy glide-through like the last time. Somehow this time it was for keeps, or he seemed to feel it was: he kept trundling back to the two Caedmons at the controls, asking what we thought the lines meant, whether we thought the poem any good at all." The verbal portrait that emerges from these liner notes suggests an insecure Thomas who was uncertain and anxious about his own performance. They note that: "He made errors and burst into the colorful profanities which he himself relished even more than his audience."[22] The notes also suggest a certain emotional volatility on Thomas' part, observing: "He tried over and over again to rid his voice of the sentimentalism with which he infused the final lines of Poem on His Birthday, but he could not read it in another way. It *was* his birthday: "And my shining men, no more alone/As I sail out to die."

While the notes for *Dylan Thomas: Volume II* captured the atmosphere of that last official recording session, they also throw some doubt on its actual date. The notes and record label affirm that *Dylan Thomas: Volume II* was made on June 2 1953. However, at the same time they also suggest that the poet recorded one of the selections, *Poem on His Birthday*, on his *actual* birthday—which was October 27. The comment that it was Thomas' birthday is at odds with the official date of this last recording session. Thomas was not in America in October of 1952. However, he was in that country in the United

States in October of 1953. Were Thomas to have recorded for Caedmon his birthday, he would have done so six days before he slipped into a fatal coma. The liner notes conclude by describing the much darker atmosphere of this second session, noting: "Our final memory is of sitting at the playback machine with Dylan, listening in exhaustion to the end of the reel. Dylan picked up a half-empty beer bottle, shook it up, and poured a blob of foam on a passing cockroach. It was about four in the morning."

Despite this scripting of the last recording session, in an interview with me Mantell remembered seeing Thomas for the last time not in the recording studio but rather at the Chelsea Hotel: "The last time I saw Dylan, he was lying down. And I sat at his bedside and I said, 'Dylan, what's wrong?' And he said, 'I'm perfectly OK, but what else is there to do? Oscar's [Williams] in the next room.'" Holdridge's account of their last contact with Thomas, which was printed in *The New York Herald Tribune* on January 12 1964, echoes Mantell's account:

> When in October he came back to die, we knew that he was ill. He would not eat, and he drank only milk. Once when we went to see him at the Chelsea we found him lying down. He explained, with something of the old impish glint, that he was trying to avoid a persistent acquaintance, not a favorite of ours. That was the old Dylan, playing one friend mischievously against another. Two weeks later he lapsed into the unconsciousness from which he did not recover. (65)

The key to recovering when Thomas' last Caedmon recording session was undertaken may be in Thomas' correspondence with Williams (the print anthologist who may be best known for his *A Little Treasury of Chief Modern Poets of England and America,* which along with the *Pleasure Dome* LP recording appears to have served as a important precursor to the *Caedmon Treasury of Modern Poetry*). That correspondence suggests that the poet probably undertook two recording sessions with the label in the five months before his death.[23] In sum, the evidence from various sources suggests that the last official recording session in June resulted in less material than was required for an LP record and that Caedmon may have recorded at least one of the tracks on *Dylan Thomas: Volume II* days before the onset of the coma that killed him. This is not to imply that

Caedmon in any way precipitated the poet's death, as Thomas' long-standing self-destructiveness and poor health is a matter of the public record.

The relationship between Thomas and Caedmon and Thomas posthumous celebrity was at the heart of Caedmon's success, however. That celebrity first arose as the result of a tribute that was aired on national television, shortly after Thomas' death. According to Mantell, the playing of Caedmon's recording of "Do Not Go Gentle into That Good Night" on NBC's *Omnibus* program caused "a national sensation." Afterwards, as she recalls, Caedmon "hit the map." While sales of the first Thomas album had been reasonably brisk, the short two-page contract written by Mantell made Caedmon's fortune because of its "retroactive" exclusivity clause, which granted Caedmon rights to obtain and release any of the recordings of Thomas made by other individuals and institutions. That clause, while not legally conventional, was, as Mantell describes it, "enforceable." With the co-operation of the trustees of Dylan Thomas' estate, the exclusivity clause remained in effect for as long as Caedmon chose to exercise it.[24] Given that the later Thomas records sold between one and two million copies apiece, the profits from this arrangement were enormous. As Ferris notes: "The copyrights of the Caedmon records and tapes became the most lucrative of the properties that generated income for the fund that helped to support Thomas' widow and young family after his death" (212). As Ferris also observes: "Thomas made rich women of Barbara Holdridge and Marianne Mantell" (313).

The exact nature of Caedmon's commercial rights to recordings of Thomas made by other individuals and institutions was unclear in the months following the poet's death, however. As a result, Mantell approached Philip Wittenberg—the copyright attorney used by Thomas' print publisher New Directions—for clarification. Wittenberg was considered to be one of the best copyright lawyers in America at the time. He also taught Columbia University's course on copyright. Caedmon's founders weren't in a financial position to pay for Wittenberg's services, however. One day after fielding a few of Mantell's queries, Wittenberg drew her attention to the fact that he customarily worked for remuneration. He also came up with a solution to her problem, however. According to Mantell: "He said to me, 'Listen, you're asking me a lot of questions and really can't take the time. However, you're . . . a graduate student at Columbia and I teach a course on copyright in the law school. A student can enter any course, so just go ahead and take my course.' Which I promptly did. And I asked my questions—couched in 'one' terms instead of 'I' and 'you.' And he always called on me and answered my questions in such a way that they were specifically directed to Caedmon and Dylan Thomas—without, once again, using the names."

However, ongoing problems with capital flow throughout 1953 meant that no records were pressed that year. The reasons for this were manifold. Unable to hire anyone, Holdridge and Mantell did all the work that was involved in running the company. The amount of time required to do this severely constrained their ability to concentrate on making new recordings. While making a raw recording was economical, tape and record mastering were expensive and even as Caedmon had to pay to have their records pressed at RCA's pressing plant in a reasonably timely fashion, they were not always able to collect money owed to them after these records until well after these had been sold. In sum, a considerable outlay of capital was involved before Caedmon could reap a financial return from any particular recording project.

Caedmon had been diversifying their catalogue with a view to producing records with more commercial appeal in light of the bottom line. One of the most important of these projects was the company's first documentary record *Israel is Born*. According to Holdridge: "The author of it [Arthur Holzman] came to see us and presented us with his tapes. They were galvanizing—a tape of the birth of Israel—and we said, 'OK. We'll do it.'" She and Mantell thought that the record had genuine historical value. Documentary records were much more expensive to produce than Caedmon's other records, however. The costs of producing *read* and *spoken text* recordings had been very low up until this point. As Bartok notes: "Recording a spoken word record is not very intricate. It doesn't require an enormous hall. It doesn't require a number of microphones to be mixed together. It is a simple machine with one microphone of good quality—not too far from and not too close to the person talking was what was needed—and a room in which there are no extraneous noises." *Israel is Born* was very different type of record that interspersed *spoken text* recordings of foundational printed documents with recordings of the historical speech events. As Holdridge recalls: "It became very expensive to do it. There was a lot of mixing. And it was very time consuming also."

However, ironically it was through producing this record Caedmon was able to stave off financial ruin although not in the way that they had initially intended. A friend of Holdridge, Marion Abeson, had suggested that Caedmon might be able to get a loan from her husband's employer. Abeson was a children's author who had been published by Liveright Corporation. Her husband's employer, Theodore Silver, was the owner of a factoring business. Factoring was widely used by producers of commodities to get immediate returns on their products. It was widely employed by New York's garment industry, which like Caedmon, produced inventory that was paid for only much later. As Holdridge recalls the importance of the factoring business: "They would take Accounts Receivables and they'd pay maybe 80% in advance. And that was all you'd get. But you'd get the 80% right away." Holdridge remembers that Silver advanced them an unprecedented 90%. As she recalls: "With that, we were able to having a cash flow. That really put us on the way." Even more importantly, Silver made them a large loan. As Holdridge recalls: "Ted Silver took one look at two very lean young women, and said, 'I'll lend you $10,000.' On the basis of *Isreal is Born.* Because he was a strong supporter of the state of Israel." Speaking with relief in her voice fifty years later, Mantell recalls: "That made a big, big, difference."

This infusion of funds permitted Caedmon to produce the raw recordings that had been made throughout 1953 and to undertake new projects. In June of 1954, Mantell went to Rutherford, New Jersey, in order to record William Carlos Williams. Bartók recorded the poet in his own home on June 6. Williams appears to have made his own selections, including his poems "For Eleanor and Bill Monahan," "The Descent" and "To Daphne and Virginia." All were from collections that spanned Williams' prolific period during the early 1950s. To judge from the warmth of the ensuing correspondence between the poet's wife and Mantell over the following years, the foursome appear to have spent a very pleasant day together. At the same time, the recording session yielded what was probably the least promising raw recording ever undertaken by Caedmon because at the time they recorded him, Williams was recovering from one of his series of strokes. The effects of this stroke were severe from Mantell's perspective. As she recalls with characteristic candor: "He recorded what he recorded. No single stretch of more than three syllables before there was a break. Whether he picked up at the same place or simply stuttered away, I'm sorry, I don't remember." Producing a record of Williams' raw performance would become one of the most challenging tasks of Mantell's career as a sound editor and was not completed until after the birth of her son—on Dylan Thomas' birthday in October of 1957— when Mantell found the necessary time to compete it. When presented with a copy of the very first pressing, the poet and his wife were overjoyed by the quality of the results, however.[25]

Caedmon recorded Marianne Moore soon afterwards. Both of Caedmon's founders recall that a considerable amount of correspondence between Caedmon and the poet transpired before she was finally persuaded to record. However, the record company faced a major impediment, which involved the fact that Moore hated the sound of her own voice. According to Holdridge, who still mimics Moore's voice with acerbic accuracy: "She detested it. She hated her reading voice. She would say—with her little nasal twang—'I wish I could read like T.S. Eliot. He took breathing lessons. Maybe I should take breathing lessons.'" According to Mantell, Moore's speaking style was particularly deficient in terms of its tonal variation or pitch. As Mantell recalls: "Her speaking voice was not very good but that was part of the interest of the recording because this imagination was the very opposite of what she said."[26] The optical poetry of the elderly Moore may have been the least likely to warrant translation into the new voice media. The dry quality of her nasal, uninflected voice was similarly unpromising. However, these factors didn't impinge upon Caedmon's desire to record her. She was recorded in Steinway Hall on June 25. Perhaps mindful of her "deficiencies" as a reader, Moore chose to read her translations of the fables of La Fontaine. However, her LP also contained small selection of her own poetry, including "Spenser's Ireland" and "What are Years?[27]

Caedmon recorded William Faulkner only months later. Considerable assistance from intermediaries was required in order to maneuver the reluctant Modern Library author into the recording studio. Holdridge recalls that his friendship with the young Jean Stein was key in securing the writer's cooperation.[28] Mantell suggests that Saxe Commins, Faulkner's editor at Random House, played an important role in convincing Faulkner to record. The flurry of September 1954 letters from Mantell to Commins indicates the evolution of Caedmon's appeals. The earliest of these, written by Mantell and dated September 8, also offers one of the clearest articulations of the effect that Caedmon wanted to achieve. As she explained to Commins:

> We are not trying to preserve a "great voice." Were that the case, Faulkner might as well read, as he himself suggested, his speeches. It is the interpretation of the writing itself we are after. We neither expect nor want the author to sound like an actor, nor the material to sound like a radio script. It is the relationship between the personality of the author and the work that we want to get down. Faulkner's argument to us was that his writing was meant for the eye rather than the ear; while we are in no position to dispute that, it in no way affects the need for establishing the relationship between author and material.

As part of her incitement to get Faulkner into the recording studio, Mantell—with typical psychological acumen—proceeded to call the author's masculinity into question by implying that Faulkner might be *afraid* of the recording process. In her letter to Commins, she conceded:

> He is shy and probably afraid like hell of a microphone; let me only say that almost all our other authors, those listed in our catalogue and three others who have been added to it since, Marianne Moore, William Carlos Williams and Gabriela Mistral, have had near nervous collapses before the recording sessions but have survived to tell others that it is really not that bad at all. The whole thing takes about two hours. Faulkner can be alone, or with as many people as he likes; and the recording can be made, if he prefers, in a private apartment or hotel room. We don't go in for glass cages.

These series of gambits were successful. Faulkner was recorded at Steinway Hall on September 30. However, Faulkner's wishes regarding the contents of his record seem to have prevailed. He was recorded reading his Nobel Prize acceptance speech and short excerpts from two of his stories, *The Fable* and *The Old Man*, along with an excerpt from his novel *As I Lay Dying*.

The Faulkner session was not characterized by much intimacy. As Holdridge recalls: "Faulkner was distracted by a baseball game and he interrupted the recording every once in a while to listen to the latest baseball score. Still, he knew whom he was recording for or to." In contrast, Mantell remembers that Faulkner was highly indifferent to them and suggests that it is highly unlikely that he bothered to learn their names. Despite this, Holdridge and Mantell suggest that the experience of recording him crystallized the value of making a sound word recording. For Mantell, part of the value of Faulkner's recording was what it revealed about his own formation as a writer. As she recalls: "Somewhere—I've forgotten what the word is—he mispronounced a word. A mispronunciation of a three or four-syllable word. I thought this was extremely interesting because it was Faulkner demonstrating the use of a word that he read but never heard." According to Mantell, this mispronunciation added value to the recording by proving the author's status as an autodidact. Normally, Mantell would have corrected a writer—as she did twenty years later when Kurt Vonnegut made a similar mistake—but the twenty-four year old did not yet have the temerity to correct a writer of Faulkner's stature.

Recording Faulkner was clearly the apex of the Caedmon venture with reference to the style of individual writers. As Mantell remarks: "Recording Faulkner was more important than recording Vonnegut because it is more rewarding to study Faulkner's style than it is to study Vonnegut's. Faulkner's voice gives you more insight into his style." For Holdridge, the Faulkner recording also exemplified the capacity of an author's own reading to uniquely illuminate his or her literary style. As she recalls: "When we recorded Faulkner, it became apparent why those sentences were so long. That's the way he spoke. And his breathing was good. He never ran out of breath when he was reading those long passages. There was a great deal that could be learned by listening to Faulkner speak. For us, it was the core of reaching for an artist's creativity."

A recording of Frank O'Connor, arranged by *Mademoiselle* editor Cyrilly Abels, was also undertaken in 1954. The self-trained O'Connor was a writer with a highly musical or ear-centred prose style that was highly conducive to sound recording. O'Connor also exemplified the literature of the common man which was so central to the Caedmon enterprise. A French language recording of Colette, reading excerpts from *Gigi* and other works, rounded out the catalogue of writer's recordings that year. A volunteer whom Mantell remembers only as Sklar recorded the writer in Paris in 1953, shortly before the her death. Caedmon also released three dramatic recordings of the Barcelona-based theatrical troupe *Compana Espanola de Teatro Universal* performing Jose Zorrilla's *Don Juan Tenorio* and Pedro Calderón de la Barca's *La Vida es Sueno* and *El Alcalde de Zalamea*—all of which were recorded in Spanish. At this point, Caedmon also began to diversify its catalogue by adding the first of the label's *spoken text* and dramatic text recordings to be produced under the direction of Howard Sackler. After the *Hearing Poetry* series, Sackler's second contribution to the Caedmon enterprise involved a production of the medieval morality play *Everyman*, which was recorded in New York at St. Bartholomew's Church and featured actors Burgess Meredith, Frank Silvera and Darrin McGavin.[29]

Even as Caedmon began to move in new directions, it remained committed to the project of recording the first generation of modern American poets, including the elusive Ezra Pound. As Caedmon's two founders appear to remember almost everything about their series of visits to the poet very differently, any reconstruction of those events must necessarily remain somewhat tenuous and open-ended. These differences include when their first visit occurred, their number of contacts with the poet, how and when they first went to St. Elizabeth's, the circumstances of their being admitted to that institution, Pound's behavior and state of mind when they arrived, and the outcome of their quest to record the poet. The only thing that the two appear to agree on is the appropriateness of their decision to attempt to record Pound despite the fact that that the poet had harangued Americans with anti-Semitic propaganda during his wartime radiobroadcasts. Were Caedmon to have restricted itself to avoiding modern writers with anti-Semitic views, whether these were privately or publicly held, the archive of spoken word recordings that the company produced would have been considerably smaller than that Caedmon recorded. As Holdridge explains simply: "Pound was one of the great seminal figures of the century. There was no question that Pound was as important a figure as Eliot and was responsible for a great of amount of poetry being published and for poets being heard."

Mantell remembers that she and Holdridge engaged in correspondence with the poet before they went to St. Elizabeth's but that she alone secured a response. As Mantell recalls: "Barbara wrote to Pound and got no answer. It finally struck us that we might get there if I signed it." (Mantell's maiden name was often used in second contacts with poets and authors when Holdridge, whose maiden name was Cohen, had been unsuccessful.) Mantell recalls that the first time they went to see Pound they drove to Washington with a man named Milt Gould who was a widower with a daughter who was a toddler at the time. As Mantell recalls: "He needed to go down to Washington for some reason and so he asked if Barbara and I would go along with him—so we could take Martha to the bathroom." She remembers that it was wintertime because they "drove down there in an old war jeep with plastic windows." As Mantell reprises her narrative: "We got to St. Elizabeth's. We must have arranged somehow to be admitted into the institution. Pound knew that we were coming. He came out toward us. Barbara claims that he threw a piece of bread with mayonnaise on it at her. What he said was, 'You must be hungry.' And he brought us this French loaf of broad with mayonnaise on it. And he handed it over, somewhat jerkily, but it was not intended as a missile. He then proceeded to say that he wasn't anti-Semitic—he hadn't not responded because her name was Cohen—and that some of his best friends were Jewish, i.e. Louis Zukovsky." This opener did not make a strong impression on Mantell. As she notes caustically: "With Jews like that, who needs enemies?"

Yet somehow from these rather inauspicious beginnings, Mantell recalls that Pound began to address his audience more engagingly. She remembers the three of them talking at great length at their first meeting. What was memorable to Mantell about Pound's attitude and demeanor was his concern with passing on his knowledge. In the process of being assailed by Pound's vision of the possibilities for publishing the spoken word, she also recalls that she unexpectedly developed an appreciation of what she calls Pound's "generosity of spirit." According to Mantell: "There was this tremendous drive to *unburden* himself of all of the things that he knew—not in politics but in poetry—that we would in fifty years be able to tell it to young people. That's the feeling I had." It was also apparent to Mantell that Pound was a "lightening rod that was attracting poets" and that he "was in constant correspondence with young people in search of guidance." It appeared to her that even in St. Elizabeth's: "It was his job, his duty, his pleasure, to guide, criticize, help them [young writers] to find publishers for their work—to do all these things." As Mantell recalls in her characteristically split sentences, it seemed "almost as if he were enrolled in the army of—you know, it's his job—a relay runner. He's passing the baton. He was passing the baton to us."

Pound's version of "passing the baton" apparently involved his ideas about a spoken word anthology to be devoted to the works of young poets. Pound spent a considerable amount of time trying to sell Caedmon on the idea of making what Mantell calls "an anthology, as it were, of new poets." In contrast, Caedmon wanted to record Pound himself. Pound and Mantell were essentially arguing about two very different forms of cultural production. Extending the principles of small press production into the field of spoken word recordings as outlined by Pound might have involved recordings that were similar to those produced by Fantasy Records later in the decade. However, at this juncture, the spoken word poetry "canon" did not yet exist. From Mantell's point of view, Pound's project was not economically feasible. With the exception of Zukovsky, she recognized none of the names that Pound was advancing as candidates. Mantell suggests that Pound "had lost his gift" while in St. Elizabeth's—not only in terms of his own ability to write but also in terms of his critical judgement with reference to the young poets whose causes he was championing: "Here was Pound, this galvanic rod, and what he attracted was not worth attracting."

Mantell recalls that they went to St. Elizabeth's in order to persuade Pound to record for them "a number of times" over the next few years. However, as she recalls: "It was never possible or he always said, 'Caged bird won't sing.' So he wouldn't record. And later, after his release had been secured but before he left, Jay [Laughlin] got someone else in there with a tape recorder." While Mantell notes that they did not successfully record Pound themselves, she observes that spent more time with Pound than they did with many of their other authors whom they actually recorded: "We talked to him much more than any of the other authors or writers because he drew us out. First of all, he had nothing to do. We were visitors and we were allowed in. There was no one else to talk to." Despite the fact that Caedmon and Pound were working at cross-purposes, in their course of their interactions Mantell also formed the firm opinion that the poet did not deserve to be in a mental institution. She became actively involved in the campaign to release him from St. Elizabeth's. As she argues: "It was pathetic to have Pound in a genuine loony bin. I mean, there were crazy people all around! And while he was not the most stable person in the world that you ever saw—*but which poet was? You do not write poetry out of the pleasure of a calm, orderly, leisurely life*—it was not a good place for a guy who was intellectually a genius."

It is a matter of public record that Pound was released from St. Elizabeth's in May of 1958. The record labels on both Pound records indicate that the poet was recorded at three sessions on June 12, 13, and 26 of 1958 and that he was recorded in a primary performance context that is referred to as "the Washington office of New Directions." Correspondence between Barbara Holdridge and James McLaughlin, which is dated July 6 1959, indicates that these recordings were made at the U.S. Recording Studio, in Washington, D.C., and the New Directions paid $300 to have them made. Pound's selection of material to be read on his Caedmon recordings and his vituperative exchange with James Laughlin about Caedmon in published correspondence would seem to belie the somewhat rosy picture that Mantell paints of their interactions. However, it also seems to be true that Mantell was genuine in her compassion. She was also in position to appeal to many poets—several of whom, perhaps coincidentally, later added their names as signatories to those petitioning for his release only after Caedmon recorded them.

Holdridge's account of meeting Pound differs substantially from that of Mantell. To begin with, Holdridge maintains that it was Archibald MacLeish facilitated their entrance to St. Elizabeth's by providing the letter of introduction that preceded their visit.[30] Holdridge also characterizes Pound's state of mind and his behavior in ways that diverge from Mantell's account. In contrast to Mantell, Holdridge remembers that the poet's behavior was volatile and unpredictable. As she recalls: "He threw a salami at me at one point. It was a salami that we had brought him to assuage his craving for good Italian junk food. And he got enraged about something—I don't remember now what—and threw the salami at me!" From her point of view, Pound's mental state was incontrovertible. As she argues: "He was certifiably insane—I mean, really!" Holdridge allows that that the poet may not have started out that way. As she concedes: "He was treated miserably in Italy. They had him standing in a cage the sun for hours at a time. That certainly didn't do him any good." Yet from Holdridge's point of view whether or not Pound should have been incarcerated at St. Elizabeth's was moot. As she argues: "It was a dodge to keep him even from being put to death. He was a traitor!"

Holdridge and Mantell also disagree about the consequence of their forays to St. Elizabeth's. Holdridge clearly remembers that they recorded Pound reading Provençal poetry on the grounds of St. Elizabeth's during what must have been their first visit to see the poet. The liner notes of the first Pound LP were also quite unequivocal that such a recording occurred. Indeed, they promised that this reading would be included on a subsequent album:

> By the afternoon he was ready to record—in Provençal, and on our promise not to release the recording while he was confined. "Bird in cage does not sing," he said many times. The machine was set up on the lawn, and Pound began to recite. These lyrics are onomatopoetic, and as he sang of birds, the birds perched overhead and sang too. In the background, inmates hooted.

If this account were true, it would have provided extra incentive to secure the poet's release. Holdridge's private files also contain a note from Pound—undated but written in his characteristically mixed style of typewriting and handwriting—that indicates that Pound was willing to record these and that he hoped to obtain a recording of Raymonde Collignon reading from his radio opera *François Villon* on the opposite side. Published correspondence between Pound and Laughlin refers to this recording (Gordon 268) as does unpublished correspondence from Laughlin to Holdridge.[31]

The existence of this recording is disputed, however. For her part, Mantell firmly denied to me that it was ever made. This dispute later became part of the acrimony that arose between Holdridge and Mantell in the wake of Caedmon's acquisition by Raytheon. In her testimony, Holdridge maintained that her partner's husband, Harold Mantell, had removed this tape from the tape storage room for the purposes of making of film and never returned it. In her testimony, Mantell acknowledged that the tape had been made and that the recording of lyrics in Provençal "was the only recording that Ezra Pound ever made for Barbara and me, the only one he was willing to make."[32] In contrast to Holdridge's account, Mantell implied that a post-Raytheon acquisition employee had been responsible for the disappearance of the Pound tape along with others. One can only speculate about the motives that might have occasioned the tape to disappear and at whose hand. Needless to say, were this recording to be located, it would constitute one of the pre-eminent voice documents of the twentieth century, and secondary in literary importance only to Joyce's recordings for Sylvia Beach and C.K. Ogden.

Caedmon successfully recorded a number of poets in 1955, however. Edith Sitwell was one of these. While Sitwell was already a kind of kitschy mass-mediated pop culture icon, she also retained the residue of a certain moral authority in the fight against fascism. Both of the Sitwells were associated with the revival of the poetry reading in wartime but Edith became associated with that practice in particular largely as the result a iconic performance that she delivered to British, Canadian and American officers at the Churchill Club in London during the bombings of the summer of 1944. With great courage, Sitwell had continued to read her poem about the 1940 Blitz, "Still Falls the Rain," refusing to take shelter even as the warning sirens wailed and buzz bombs thundered directly above before detonating nearby (Glendinning 243). Americans appear to have been fascinated by Sitwell at the time. In addition to her attempts to develop a script for George Cukor, Sitwell's theatrical reading tours, in which she combined performances of her poetry with performances of scenes from *Macbeth,* were then earning her fees of up $1700 a night. More immediately in relation to the field of LP production, Caedmon's rationale for recording Sitwell was based on the popularity of Columbia's recording of the once-notorious *Façade*. As Mantell notes: "Yeats, Pound, Eliot, whatever, she was not part of that tree, but nonetheless was a saleable and interesting commodity."

Both of Caedmon's founders remember the moment that they met Sitwell, descending the staircase that led into the lobby of the St. Regis Hotel. Although they didn't know it at the time, Sitwell was in mourning for the recently deceased Queen Mary. At six feet tall and dressed head to toe entirely in black, she formed an imposing figure. Despite her formidable appearance, the two struck up an instant rapport with the poet and subsequently met her whenever she came to New York. They weren't able to persuade her to record for them immediately, however.

The recording session at Steinway Hall with Sitwell was eventually undertaken at Steinway Hall on March 2 1955. Holdridge recalls that Bartók was clearly mystified and intimidated by "this regal black-clad figure with the veil and the black headdress." Because of Sitwell's eccentric habits, Mantell had taken the precaution of advising Bartók to simply agree with whatever the poet said rather than to engage in conversation with her directly. Matters were complicated by the fact that Bartók, who speaks with a heavily Hungarian-inflected accent, had considerable difficulty in understanding Sitwell's extremely clipped aristocratic English. Their attempts to communicate reached a comic crescendo when Sitwell inadvertently spilled the glass of water at her feet and warned to Bartók to "watch out for the puddle." Misunderstanding the nature of her warning, the engineer made an assumption that a dog was hiding in the folds of Sitwell's voluminous dress—and quietly conferred with Mantell about what to do with the "poodle."

Caedmon's choice to record Conrad Aiken appears to have involved a clear instance in which they followed their own taste and released a recording for which there was no major popular market. Mantell notes that Aiken "was an undervalued writer." Holdridge concurs: "These days his reputation is in eclipse but he was an important figure in the twenties." Upon meeting Aiken, Holdridge remembers being impressed by a large painting on the wall of Aiken's cold-water sixth floor walk-up, which was located in the slums of East Sixty-Third Street. The exuberant and colorful painting by Edward Burrough that had been inspired by Aiken's poem "The Blues of Ruby Matrix." Mantell recalls that the Aikens served them drinks and canapés and that she complimented them on the canapés by asking: "This is delicious. What is it?" The poet's wife Mary gaily replied: "Puss and Boots." As Mantell recalls: "They were poor—genuinely poor."

Holdridge and Mantell, who both tend to favor the underdog, developed a strong affection for the pair. As Holdridge recalls: "They were most hospitable to us. They invited us to the Cape Cod house several times. We'd spend a weekend there. They'd go out to find mussels on the beach and Mary would steam them. We'd have them with martini after martini. They were delightful people." Despite this affection, Mantell also recalls that the elderly poet was one of the few who made a pass at her. Aiken was recorded in New York on June 23. Although Caedmon was facing severe financial difficulties at the time, Holdridge and Mantell used an expensive four-color reproduction process in order that Burrough's painting could grace the cover. "We really spurged on that one," as Holdridge recalls.

Shortly afterwards, Mantell went to London for an audience with T.S. Eliot—a poet whose star had traveled very much in the opposite direction since he and Aiken had studied together at Harvard. Company correspondence indicates that Caedmon had been pursuing Eliot since 1953 when Mantell first spoke to the poet, apparently over the telephone, while the poet was in St. Louis. A follow-up letter from Mantell, dated July 1, elaborated the nature of the Caedmon enterprise and outlined the advantages that recording for the company might afford Eliot:

> I believe I told you that we have a series of recordings of authors reading from their works, including at the moment Dylan Thomas, Thomas Mann, Katherine Anne Porter, Archibald MacLeish, the three Sitwells, Auden, Cummings, Colette, O'Casey, and Eudora Welty, which we distribute to book as well as record stores. The distribution is a very important aspect, because although the people who are interested in a literary record will go to extraordinary lengths to get it, they have got to know that record exists before they can go to any kind of lengths. And with all the interest in an Eliot record, with all the copies that Harvard and the Library of Congress and the HMV records have sold, hardly anybody knows that records by you can be had.
>
> You also said that you were dissatisfied with your previous recordings and would like plenty of time to make new ones, and we are certainly prepared to underwrite such a project. Our engineer, Peter Bartok, happens to be on his way to London with his recording equipment, and he is ready to record you at your leisure at your home, or a studio, or wherever you are likely to feel most like reading. Bartok happens to be the most sensitive engineer in the whole field (his records of his father's music are unbelievably good) so that technically we will feel, and people at a later time will feel, that the best possible job has been done.

Despite these inducements, Eliot was not moved to record. As Mantell recalls of her two-year quest to meet the poet: "Eliot, until I got to meet him, appeared to be a difficult prima donna." She concedes that this was likely because "Every Tom, Dick and Harry naturally wanted something to do with him."

As with many of the other poets and authors whom Caedmon recorded, an intermediary was needed to advance Caedmon's cause. Caedmon found that advocate in Peter du Sautoy, a Faber and Faber. According to Mantell: "He was a business-like guy who understood writing, understood poetry, understood that publishing was a business and understood the validity of the spoken word." Even in 1953, Mantell had taken the precaution of sending du Sautoy the same letter as she had sent to Eliot and on that occasion it was du Sautoy who responded. In a letter dated July 14, he informed Mantell that undertaking these recordings would require considerable effort on the part of Eliot and that Eliot was not prepared to undertake such effort unless he could be persuaded it was likely to improve in an improvement upon his earlier records. Du Sautoy also informed Mantel that Eliot was not interested recording a production of *Murder in the Cathedral* as this had already been undertaken by another company but that Eliot would well disposed to a recording of *The Family Reunion,* particularly if Caedmon's production were to star John Gielgud.[33] By February of 1955, matters had progressed to the point where Mantell was outlining a projected three disc-record series: she envisioned that this series would include the shorter poems on Volume I, *The Waste Land* on Volume II and *Four Quartets* on Volume III.[34] Du Sautoy reported that Eliot was prepared to discuss the matter in person and Mantell was accorded an appointment with Eliot in his Faber and Faber offices in mid-July of that year. As Mantell recalls: "I had a thirty minute slot in which to convince him."

Matters were complicated by the fact that Mantell's purpose in gaining an audience with Eliot appears to have been twofold because she had been pressed beforehand by MacLeish to use the opportunity to urge Eliot to sign the petition to free Pound. Mantell decided to use her thirty-minute slot to her advantage by importuning Eliot on Pound's behalf even before the poet admitted her into his office. As she recalls: "He [Eliot] got up and met me outside his office. The first thing I said to him, after introductions were made—like a real idiot—was, 'You know, I don't think you are doing enough to help Ezra Pound.'" Eliot appeared to be stung by her words. As Mantell recalls: "He was literally taken aback." Eliot responded by asking: "What should I do?" As Mantell remembers: "I told him to get in touch with Archie and what kind of letter he needed to write." Eliot appears to have countered her impudence by humorously asserting his god-like prerogative once they were inside his office. As Mantell recalls: "This was a period in July, in London, with rain. And then all of a sudden, as he reached a comma in his speech, there was a tremendous thunderclap like punctuation from above. And Eliot said, 'Pardon me!' And I said, 'That's all right.'" As Mantell concedes: "That was very, very funny."

This vision of the twenty-five year old admonishing Eliot might seem implausible were it not for Mantell's caustic personality and the fact that her actions are consistent with the close relationship that Mantell and Holdridge appear to have developed with "Archie" MacLeish. Mantell is also particularly savvy in psychological terms. She may have reasoned that her tactic would have given her a negotiating advantage with Eliot. As she recalls proudly: "Nobody had challenged Eliot for decades." Mantell seems to have entered the poet's office under the impression that that Eliot would record for her. As she notes: "By the summer of 1955, it was perfectly clear that we were building an archive of twentieth century poetry." From Mantell's point of view, the real issue seems to have been the terms and the contents of the recording. As she recalls: "We'd suggested in writing what I wanted him to record." Eliot did in fact agree to record. The contents of the record that Caedmon subsequently released in March of the following year, *T.S. Eliot Reading Poems and Choruses*, corresponded very closely Mantell's proposals for *Volume One*. They included "Prufrock," "Portrait of a Lady," "Preludes," "Mr. Eliot's Sunday Morning Service," "Ash Wednesday," "Song for Simon," "Marina" and "Triumphal March." A chorus from Eliot's religious verse play *The Rock* was included as were the opening chorus from *Murder in the Cathedral* and a chorus from the second act of *The Family Reunion*.

However, Eliot appears to have had the last laugh in his battle of wits with Mantell. While his performance of *The Waste Land* was subsequently included on the *Caedmon Treasury*, it was not released as a single LP. Nor was Eliot's spoken word recording of *The Four Quartets,* which Mantell had projected for *Volume 3*, which was awarded to the record company. Instead, it was licensed in the United States the classical music label Angel. *Four Quartets* would remain in Angel's prestigious but relatively small catalogue—but largely unavailable for purchase—in ways that clearly limited the material dissemination of that work in the American context. However, apparently Eliot willed it so: Caedmon would acquire the rights to reproduce both works only five years after Eliot's death and in the post-acquisition period when Holdridge and Mantell no longer owned the company.

These negotiations between Caedmon and Eliot may not have been as hostile as they seem. Eliot may merely have been playing the game of placing his spoken word performances in different publication venues in ways that echoed his well-known strategies regarding the publication of his works in print. However, the easygoing Bartók also recalls that the poet was an extraordinarily difficult person to work with. Bartók had agreed to record Eliot while he was in London to make orchestral recordings. Bartók planned to be in London from September 19 to September 22. He hoped to take a skiing vacation in Switzerland after that date. As Bartók recalls: "I went there to London. I was told Mr. Eliot would be available in ten days' time. So ten days' time was a little long to wait in a London hotel but the time between the ten days was really not enough time for my planned vacation. I explained to Faber and Faber. They were adamant. That was the one day that Mr. Eliot was available and not a few days sooner and not a few days afterward. So I had to go back to Switzerland, interrupt my vacation, come back to London to make the recording, and fly back to Switzerland to conclude my vacation."

These difficulties seem to have arisen because a contract with the poet had not been signed before the engineer arrived in London to make the recording. As Bartók explains: "By the time I was called in, the artist or actor has made a commitment to make the record. I was only supposed to make the mechanical effort of recording him." Caedmon's business records reveal that a very different situation prevailed in relation to Eliot. Faber and Faber sent Caedmon a cable on September 15 indicating that Eliot had cancelled his plans to record on the 26 and 28 because he found his contract with Caedmon "unacceptable." A reply sent from Caedmon to Bartók indicated that Holdridge and Mantell were empowering the engineer to initial changes to the contract on Caedmon's behalf. Two days before the proposed recording session, another cable from Bartók to Caedmon indicated that Eliot was requesting a five-hundred dollar prepaid advance before he would record, the right to reject all items that he recorded while keeping this advance, and the right to limit the recording session to four hours. A cable from Caedmon to Bartók, which was dated a day before the proposed recording session, indicated that these terms were acceptable to the company but that in exchange Caedmon wanted the right to release Eliot's Library of Congress recordings if he didn't record enough material to make a record.

Apparently the charming engineer, who was always one of Caedmon's strongest assets, was able to work his magic after Eliot met him. As Bartók recalls: "Once we were there, in the recording session, everything went fine." Eliot's performance as reader was so polished and professional that very little editing needed to be done. According to Bartók, the recording he made was essentially the record that Caedmon later released. While in London, Bartók had also recorded the ailing poet Walter de la Mare at du Sautoy's suggestion. Like the session with Eliot, the scheduling of de la Mare recording session did not run smoothly but for a very different reason. The health of the elderly poet was rapidly declining. As a result, de la Mare's nurse cancelled the planned session three mornings in a row. The pragmatic Bartók reasoned that de la Mare's health was not likely to improve in the near future and decided to ignore the ringing telephone on the fourth day and instead proceeded directly to the poet's apartment. As Bartók recalls, once there: "Everything went fine. He made a beautiful record." However, the engineer's assessment of the poet's declining health turned out it to be correct as de la Mare died shortly afterwards.

After Mantell left London, she went to California to undertake a series of *spoken text* recordings of actors reading historical literature. At the end of that trip, she also went to Cuba where she had hope that Caedmon holdout Ernest Hemingway might finally acquiesce to record. Mary Hemingway had written to Mantell on October 18 1955 to inform her that the writer had finally consented to the idea and that he proposed to read his poetry. Mary Hemingway also indicated that her husband's lawyer, Alfred Rice, would have to agree to the financial terms before any recording could take place. Mantell proceeded to Cuba before this had in fact occurred. Caedmon had often been in this position with other writers. Many agreed to proceed with the scheduled session knowing that Caedmon could not release these recordings without a contract. However, Caedmon and Hemingway had not yet come to terms and Mantell lost her nerve. As she recalls: "I just didn't have the guts to get a taxi and go to the door and ring the bell." However, she apparently came very close to knocking because she later reported to Bartók that she had counted ninety-nine cats waiting outside the gates of the writer's villa.

The trip to Cuba had been financed by a loan from a bank officer who was sympathetic to the idea of recording Hemingway. Ultimately, obtaining this loan may have been more important than actually recording the author. In general, 1955 was characterized by continuing financial strain of such severity that Mantell recalls it as "a period of crisis." At one point, Caedmon owed RCA's record pressing plant some $3,000 and the plant was refusing to ship Caedmon product. This state of affairs would have spelled calamity for the young record company were it not for another of Mantell's creative solutions. Taking into account that RCA's bookkeeping operation was not in Gloversville, the location of its pressing plant, but instead at the relatively distant Rockaway, New Jersey, Mantell wrote Hank Reifke in Accounts Receivable and told him that she would love to pay the bill but that she had a question about the invoice. She then quoted him the invoice number, transposing two numbers. The hapless Reifke spent months trying to find the invoice. In the interim, RCA resumed pressing.

With a lot of recordings in various stages of the sound production process and awaiting a new influx of working capital, Caedmon also turned in another dramatically new direction in 1955 when it began to supplement its "first edition" sound recordings with copies of archival recordings. Fittingly, Vachel Lindsay—the poet who had first approached Victor and Columbia University with recording proposals—was the first pre-LP era poet to be memorialized in the vinyl archive. In turning to the sound recording archive, Caedmon like other record labels was recovering foundational voice documents of the era of partial sound spectrum recording as 78-*rpm* recordings began to disappear.

The following year, Caedmon raided the sound recording archive once again in order to retrieve a recording of Gertrude Stein, who had been recorded performing her work on NBC radio during her last visit to the United States in the winter of 1934 and 1935. Along with Eliot, Frost and Sandburg, Stein's name was known to Caedmon's audiences but for a different reason. As Holdridge recalls: "Stein was known because she was ridiculed so much." Stein's name was frequently invoked on comedy hours. As Holdridge recalls: "That 'rose is a rose' was sneered at as the apex—or the nadir—of the snobbish excess that some city slickers had gotten into." Caedmon's record included

Stein's reading of *The Making of Americans, Parts I and II* and several of her portrait prose poem series, including "Valentine to Sherwood Anderson," "If I Told Him: A Completed Portrait of Picasso," "Matisse" and "Madame Recamier: An Opera." As Mantell recalls of the decision to add Stein to the Caedmon catalogue: "It didn't sell well. We didn't expect it to sell well. But it was around. Obviously, it belonged in our catalogue. Had she been around, we would have recorded her."

Even as Caedmon began to raid sound recording archives, it continued its own project to record them. Robert Frost was the next poet to be recorded. Unlike its approaches to other writers, Caedmon's appeals to Frost—or more accurately to his print publisher—were clearly made on explicitly commercial grounds. Writing to A.C. Edwards of Henry Holt on March 17 1956 Holdridge described the standard Caedmon contract and promised Frost a hefty $1,000 advance. She also outlined the kinds of sales figures that Frost might reasonably expect:

> While it is foolish to try to calculate the number of Frost records which we can sell, there is no question in our minds concerning the high potential of sales. We have, up to the present date, sold about 60,000 Dylan Thomas records. Of our T.S. Eliot record, released three months ago, we have sold 3,000 copies already. A Frost record will certainly do better than Eliot, and if the sales charts of every one of our recordings are any indication, will climb in sales in each year.

Apparently, Frost and his publisher found Caedmon's terms acceptable. The poet was recorded in Cambridge, Massachusetts on May 21 of that year.

Both of Caedmon's founders recall that the Frost recording was memorable for the exigencies of timing their arrival at Frost's home. There was a precise calculus involved in getting Bartók to show up anywhere on time. Normally, Holdridge and Mantell would tell the engineer that he needed to arrive an hour earlier than he was actually expected for any given appointment. However, this stratagem wouldn't work in this case of Frost because they were expected at nine in the morning. Instead, Mantell threatened the engineer with a manner of dire consequences should he fail to arrive on time. While Caedmon's founders took the bus up to Cambridge, Bartók himself drove there with his Ampex. Perhaps because of the severity of Mantell's admonishments his arrival on this occasion unexpectedly preceded theirs for the one and only occasion during his career with Caedmon. Upon Holdridge and Mantell's arrival, Frost's mistress Kate greeted them by announcing: "I was so worried when this foreigner showed up—because Mr. Frost is not so fond of foreigners!" As Mantell caustically notes: "As it turned out, Frost was delighted to talk to Peter. Peter, because of his background, was very adept at dealing with father figures who were used to having their own way." (Indeed, Frost was so relaxed that that he recorded twice as much material as was actually needed for his LP.)

Bartók made two other records for Caedmon in 1956. Stephen Spender was recorded on October 20 reading a number of his short lyric poems and his elegiac poem, "Dylan Thomas November, 1953." The recording session, which was undertaken in the auditorium Manhattan's Washington Jefferson High School, seems to have been particularly unmemorable. Indeed, although neither of Caedmon's founders has directly admitted so to me, it does not sound like either of them was actually present. Bartók also recorded Noel Coward reading scenes from his play, *Brief Encounter,* with actress Margaret Leighton in 1956. The only other only recording of a poet or author to be announced in the period between 1952 and 1957 was one of Wallace Stevens. Mantell recalls that Caedmon had discussed the prospect of a recording with Stevens by telephone, and that Stevens tried to deflect Caedmon by telling them that he had already recorded for a radio station. Mantell reports that he relented after Mantell told him that Caedmon wanted "something more personal." As she recalls: "He was ready to record but then he died. So we called the radio station." Stevens had been recorded for the *Voice of America* radio program and the WGBH program *The Poet Speaks*; he had also been recorded reading his poems at Harvard. Caedmon's recording drew on the Harvard and WGBH recordings and included Stevens' performance of "The Idea of Order at Key West, "Credences of Summer," and "The Poem That Took Place of a Mountain."

However, company correspondence indicates that long before the all-Stevens' recording was at the production stage, Caemdon had already completed production of a very different record that featured Stevens—*The Caedmon Treasury of Modern Poets Reading*—as a seminal two-disc audio anthology of Caedmon first five years as a publisher of the spoken word. Caedmon's business records indicate that Holdridge and

Mantell decided to produce the anthology in 1956. The anthology of modern poetry appears to have been envisioned as an educational aid to a Ford Foundation sponsored handbook that was then being compiled by Elizabeth Drew of Smith College, which was intended for the use of Adult Education groups all across the country. Drew's subject was "Discovering Modern Poetry."[35] As conceived of by Drew, the anthology was to be used with a series of sound recordings. According to Holdridge, they proceeded with their plan to make an anthology by compiling a list much as they had when the first began recording. As Holdridge elaborates: "They were the poets we considered great and who ought to be represented in the recording. There was nothing missing that we would liked to have there. They were definitely our personal choices of what we wanted to have on the recording. The whole catalogue was. It was a very personal catalogue." As Holdridge adds: "It was our take on what was great literature and what was worthy of being presented. It *was* a treasury. If it was a book, we would have signed our names to it."

At the same time, the two-disc *Treasury* effectively became an anthology of the entire field of spoken word recordings. Selections from Caedmon's own catalogue began only midway through *Side Two*. They included W.H. Auden's reading of "In Memory of W. B. Yeats," two of Dylan Thomas' poems, "A Refusal to Mourn the Death, by Fire, of a Child in London" and "Fern Hill," and Robert Graves' reading of "Poem to my Son" from a not-yet-released Caedmon album. *Side Three* included Gertrude Stein's reading of "If I Told Him (A Complete Portrait of Picasso)," Archibald MacLeish's "Epistle to be Left in the Earth," e. e. cummings' "what if a much of a which of wind and sweet spring is your . . . .," Marianne Moore's "What Are Years?" and Stephen Spender's "Seascape." *Side Four* presented Robert Frost's recording of "Birches" and "After Apple Picking" along with Wallace Stevens' reading "The Idea of Order of Key West" from his not-yet-released Caedmon album.

Caedmon supplemented its own recordings with those made by other recorders. Most notably, the *Treasury* included material that had been recorded by or lodged in the Library of Congress as a national archive. T.S. Eliot's complete performance of *The Waste Land*, which the poet had refused to record for Caedmon, formed the entire side of *Side One*.[36] Caedmon obtained this recording from the Library of Congress by indeterminate means—possibly by using permission from Eliot that had been obtained as part of the preliminaries of making his own recording for Caedmon. The *Treasury* also included archival recordings of W.B. Yeats' radio performances during the 1930s, including "The Song of the Old Mother," "Innisfree" and an excerpt from "Coole and Ballylee." Caedmon was lucky to get the metal masters of these recordings as most of the Yeats' plates that had been made by the BBC had been sent to Australia during the war and melted down for the purpose of making cannonballs. The *Treasury* also included recordings made by other recorders of poets that had already recorded for Caedmon. William Carlos Williams' Caedmon recording had not yet been edited so the company used an earlier recording of his performance of "The Sea Farer." Other recordings of this type included Conrad Aiken's reading of "Tetélestai" and Edith Sitwell's performance of "Still Falls the Rain."[37] Caedmon also made what Mantell terms "add-ons" to the *Treasury* involving recordings of poets that were not included in the Caedmon catalogue but which were nonetheless representative the best of modern poetry. These appear to have been made in order to include contemporary poets. Originally, the *Treasury* was to include recordings of Elizabeth Bishop, William Empson, Alan Tate, and John Crowe Ransom. Of these, only Empson's performance of "Missing Dates" and Bishop's performance of "Manueizinho" were ultimately included. Louis MacNiece was recorded specifically for the *Treasury* in April of 1957, performing his poems "Turfstacks" and "Refugees." Richard Eberhart and Richard Wilbur were also added; Eberhart read "The Groundhog" while Wilbur read "Love Calls Us to the Things of This World."

Were the *Treasury* merely an anthology of Caedmon recordings, it would most likely have been published early in 1957. By July of 1956, some three months after the first correspondence with Drew, Holdridge and Mantell were already negotiating with individual writers and their print publishers in order to obtain permissions to release Library of Congress recordings of writers that Caedmon had not chosen to record or had not yet been able to record, but the recording took a lot of correspondence to achieve. A letter from Wallace Stevens' daughter Holly indicated that Caedmon had announced both *Poems by Wallace Stevens* and *The Caedmon Treasury of Modern Poets Reading Their Poetry* in their fall 1956 catalogue. In that letter, which was dated November 16 1956, Stevens also inquired upon whose authority Caedmon was issuing these records. A swift reply from Mantell, which was dated four days later, informed Stevens that Alfred A. Knopf had already signed a contract authorizing the release of the recordings and that although Holly Stevens did not own these rights, she would be receiving her share of royalties for them. The letter also informed Stevens she might want to know "that the Treasury has been produced but not yet released; and that the solo record has not yet reached the production stage, though we hope to have it ready some time in the spring."

Correspondence between Caedmon and William A. Koshland of Alfred A. Knopf, dated January 29 1957, also indicated that the *Treasury* had been pressed. It reveals that Caedmon had already sent Koshland a copy of the "the album containing *The Idea of Order at Key West*," explicitly framing that the unnamed album was "now legal," while simultaneously reporting that the "all-Stevens record" was "not yet ready." Clearly, a few obstacles remained at this juncture. (MacNeice's contribution, which was recorded a few months later, almost certainly replaced another selection.) While Holly Stevens was mollified, others weren't. Indeed, the publishing history behind the *Treasury* appears to have been one of Caedmon's greatest battles. While Faber and Faber and T.S. Eliot appear to have been willing to look the other way about Caedmon's use of *The Waste Land*—to the extent they may have permitted Caedmon to use the recording without a contract while paying royalties for over twenty years—others were not so easily swayed.[38] After Elizabeth Bishop's death a "dragon" associated with her estate withdrew permission to use the recording of her that had been used on the *Treasury*. As a result, thirteen years later, in 1969, Bishop's voice-image was removed from Caedmon's anthology of modern poets, as this had been fashioned in the summer of 1956. In Bishop's place, a poet whose presence would otherwise have been unthinkable during that period was quietly added. That poet was Ezra Pound.

NOTES

[1] From this point forward, Holdridge and Mantell would send taxis to collect writers in order to deliver them to wherever location where Caedmon happened to be recording—a protocol remained in place for the duration of the Caedmon enterprise.

[2] Olivier chose to divide the proceeds between Actor's Fund of America and the Episcopal Actor's Guild, which directed the proceeds to a fund for indigent elderly English actors residing in New York.

[3] On many different occasions, Mantell and Holdridge have affirmed that *A Child's Christmas in Wales* was first published in *Mademoiselle* and not *Harper's Bazaar*. It may be that a version of this story was published in both periodicals. In *Dylan Thomas in Print*, Ralph Maud notes that the story was published in a number of venues in shorter and longer versions from 1945 onward. Maud lists the first print publication of the story with this title in the December 1950 issue of *Harper's Bazaar* (190).

---

[4] Although neither of Caedmon's founders reported so to me, Mantell told Thomas' biographer Paul Ferris that that Thomas was drunk at this first recording session. As Ferris reported: "Mrs. Mantell thinks he was drunk when it was recorded; she and Mrs. Holdridge wondered afterwards if he altogether realized what he was doing" (275).

[5] Indeed, Olivier must have liked the quality of the results. As Mantell recalls, "Olivier was auditioning for a role in John Gay's [film] *The Beggar's Opera*. He would have to sing in this. He had never sung before. He had just recorded the funeral oration. He was appearing in New York in alternate performances of *Anthony and Cleopatra* and Shaw's *Cleopatra*, together with his then-wife Vivien. And so he said, 'Can you help me?" Bartók undertook the recording session. However, because of her singing background, Olivier pressed Mantell into a very different role, that of his director. According to Mantell: "He would do a take and say, 'How did that sound?' And, after a while, he convinced me that he meant it and I began to say, 'You know, I think . . . .' This was after all singing, not acting. And he was very eager." According to Mantell, once the actor was satisfied with his performance, "He then let us edit it and we sent it off."

[6] Addressed to "Your Majesty" Mantell's letter of April 8th read: "We have taken the liberty of sending you some copies of Sir Laurence Olivier's recording of his address in commemoration of his late Majesty. Please accept them as an expression also of our feelings, at once sad and hopeful." Two years later, in the context of responding to a complaint by the BBC about what the corporation saw as the unauthorized use of its radio broadcast of the King's funeral on the second side of the record, Mantell noted that she had received verbal permission for such use. Mantell also noted that noted that the young Queen had written back to Caedmon "to tell us how much she appreciated it [the record]," and that the Queen herself had apparently turned the recording over to the BBC, which had subsequently broadcast it on the air.

[7] Ernest Hemingway, unpublished letter to Barbara Cohen, July 20 1952.

[8] Mann's memoir, *The Story of a Novel,* reveals that he read his work frequently at Hunter College during the war and that many of his live readings at different venues were recorded by Archibald MacLeish for the Library of Congress.

[9] Like many exiled German writers and intellectuals, Mann was directly linked to the OWI. His wartime radio broadcasts addressed the German speaking community within America. After 1942, they were also projected overseas into Germany through the *Voice of America* program. Mann also contributed to the German language print press in America during the war and afterward. A number of these essays were also published in periodical publications directed towards Germans within Germany, immediately after the end of the war, and were part of the process of re-democratizing German media systems.

[10] In general, Mantell is outlining the 'upside-down' principles of a semi-restricted field of cultural production as elaborated by Pierre Bourdieu. In effect, interpenetration between covert forms of ideological production and commercial forms of cultural production appear to have underwritten the humanist publishing renaissance of the war and postwar years, including that of spoken word publishing as a paraliterary field of cultural production. Independent record companies were in a particularly strong position to capitalize on this new form of cultural production as sales of only five hundred copies of any given recording were required in order to break even. In this, they enjoyed a distinct advantage over print publishers that published on a similarly small scale. Because of the philosophy of publishing as a cultural mission that prevailed after the war and the economics of the independent recording business, Caedmon was able to build a catalogue around these principles. The field of publishing in general and of spoken word publishing in particular would be very much changed in later years.

[11] The poet, dramatist, and former editor of *Fortune* magazine had served President Roosevelt's administrations in various capacities, including his periods of tenure as the coordinator of America's domestic educational radio projects and as the Librarian of Congress; as the Director to the Office of Facts and Figures as a defensive precursor to the Office of War Information and various roles within the OWI during wartime; and as the Under-Secretary of State in charge of Cultural Affairs who served as the State Department's first—and highly influential—liaison with UNESCO.

[12] Disposition of Barbara Holdridge, p. 40.

[13] The partners had realized very early on that Michael Sonino was a complete failure as an art director. According to Holdridge: "Michael came up with a concept, a pattern. His idea was to make a series, identifiable by a particular pattern. The same pattern on each record jacket, with the variable being the colour. They were *horrible.* And after he made a few we said that was it." Instead, Caedmon began to commission record covers from New York's graphic designers on an individual basis.

---

[14] After the poet's death, Marion granted Caedmon the rights to publish recordings of the six "Non-Lectures" that the poet had made at Harvard. Caedmon subsequently published these in 1965. Marion also later worked closely with Mantell's husband, Harold, who produced a documentary about the poet while employed as a filmmaker for the United States Information Agency.

[15] Unpublished letter from Marianne Roney to Ogden Nash, 12 Feb. 1953.

[16] Unpublished letter from Marianne Roney to Ogden Nash, 14 Feb. 1967.

[17] Mrs. Byrne was less pleased, however. She wrote to Caedmon two months after the recording session, threatening to withhold access to Auden on the grounds that Nash had yet to be paid his advance. Despite promises about its timing the release of the Nash record does not appear to have occurred until spring of 1954, when it was first announced in the *Schwann Long-Playing Record Catalogue*. On this occasion, the particularities of manufacturing the Nash record would appear to have arisen because Caedmon did not have the funds to press it. This timing would turn out to be of import in relation to Nash because Mrs. Byrne had negotiated a provision that unless the record was published within nine months after it was recorded "all rights granted in this contract will revert to the Author." (The Nash record was played on radio on at least one occasion in 1953, on Chicago's WFMT station in October of that year; indeed, in this particular circumstance the playing of selections of the Nash recording on the air appears to have constituted its "publication.") Unpublished letter from Mrs. James Byrne to Marianne Roney, April 28th 1953

[18] Unpublished letter from Marianne Roney to W.H. Auden, 13 Feb. 1953.

[19] According to Mantell, its admissions officer had written a rejection letter Virginia Goldersleeve, Roney's High School of Music and Art referee (who went on to play a prominent role in UNESCO), which informed Goldersleeve: "Unfortunately, we have all the Einsteins that we need for the Class of '48."

[20] Paul Fussell analyzes Osbert's verbal excess as a strategic response to the utilitarian use of language during wartime. According to Fussell, Sitwell's verbose poetry functioned as a kind of verbal feast in that: "The verbally deprived could gorge themselves upon this convoluted prose, and relish the extravagance with which he recreated a suddenly familiar world which everyone had lost" (225, 227-8).

[21] "Wrack at Steinway Hall," *The New Yorker*, 14 Mar. 1953: 25-6.

[22] In an interview with Paul Ferris, Holdridge later recalled that that Thomas had difficulty reading at this last recording session and that he slurred his words and swore at the microphone. She reported that out of loyalty to Thomas she later "took the tape and passed it over the eraser head, so that it couldn't become a party piece" (292).

[23] A June 22, 1953 from Thomas to Williams referred to the poet's plans to record for Holdridge and Mantell—whom he called "the Hairies" because of their penchant for wearing their hair long—again upon his return to New York. A later letter from Thomas to Williams, dated July 28, also from Laugharne, was furious in tone and suggests that Thomas was not paid for a full session: "The Caedmon Hairies, Marianne & Barbara, paid me only 200 dollars of the 500 dollars they were supposed to pay me—on signing of contract—for that last recording of my own poems. They promised to send me—personally, not to my agent—the other 300 by July 1st. I'm writing this, rot them, on July 28th. I want their hairy money." See Ferris, *Dylan Thomas: The Collected Letters* (901-902; 908).

[24] The three trustees that constituted the Thomas estate chose to continue the poet's contractual relationship with Caedmon. In an unpublished letter addressed to Barbara Holdridge and dated Nov. 4 of 1954, one of these trustees, David Higham, who was Thomas' English literary agent, authorized Caedmon to collect all extant tapes of Thomas performing his work "with a view to reproducing them eventually in part or whole on records." At a certain point the estate appears to have explored the possibility of diversification regarding the body of Thomas's spoken word recordings. In another unpublished letter to Marianne Roney, dated May 13 1955, Higham informed her of his decision to reserve three of Thomas' recordings of unidentified works for the new British label, the Caedmon imitator Argo. However, Caedmon appears to have prevailed because subsequent recordings of the poet reading were released on the label.

[25] A letter from Florence Williams, which was dated March 3 1957 and written in her characteristically exuberant style noted that while she was saddened by the deterioration in the poet's vocal performance, she was pleased with the recording as "a true representation" of the poet's voice.

[26] The critical implications of silent quality of Moore's highly optical verse appear to have been lost on Mantell, whose concept of the validity of recording voiced performance was based on an assumption that writers heard a voice in their heads as they composed and this voice was the source of the poet's

inspiration. This may have been true of poets with a well-developed aural imagination but many modernist poets were eye-centred rather than ear-centred. Arguably, what Gerald Diepeveen recognizes as Moore's strangely noiseless poetry, was the most extreme of these cases (68).

[27] While Moore's recording session occurred in June of 1954 and was announced in Schwann Long Playing Record Catalogue in May of that year, it does not seem to have been published until much later. OCLC, a librarian's database, indicates the some of this material was recorded on July 20, 1955. It seems likely that Caedmon sometimes supplemented a recording session with material recorded at a later date, as it almost certainly did in the case of *Dylan Thomas Volume II.* Throughout this dissertation, I have relied extensively on the *Schwann* catalogue for the dating of Caedmon's record releases as sound recordings were not required to be dated by law until 1976. Caedmon's record labels typically listed the recording date on the first edition recordings of authors and poets performing their own works. However, the date when a raw recording was made and the date when that voice document was subsequently published often varied by years. In cases where Caedmon published actors' recordings or material that it had not itself recorded no date was given. However, in general the *Schwann* catalogue is essential as a secondary source in establishing the chronological order in which albums were recorded if not necessarily published.

[28] Stein, who was the daughter of MCA's president Jules Stein, volunteered her services at both Caedmon and *The Paris Review.* In general, Caedmon was always ready to avail itself of the "groupies" whom Mantell remembers as "guys around who were looking for things to do." Another one of these unpaid hangers on was Trumble Barton the Third, who effectively functioned as Caedmon's first unpaid shipping clerk.

[29] Meredith had been particularly prominent in the fight against fascism. In particular, he had coordinated the participation of radio stars in the 1941 series *The Free Company Presents: A Collection About the Meaning of America.* That series was directed by Elmer Rice, William Saroyan, and former *Vanity Fair* writer Robert Sherwood, and featured radio plays that were written by Saroyan and Sherwood as well as Archibald MacLeish, Sherwood Anderson and Orson Welles among others.

[30] Neither of Caedmon's founders has specified when this visit occurred. David M. Gordon, the editor of published correspondence between Pound and James Laughlin, suggests that this event occurred in 1952 and that the poet was first recorded by Holdridge and Mantell that year (269). Holdridge's private copies of correspondence between Caedmon and MacLeish reveal a flurry of activity in early 1955. They indicate that Caedmon was attempting to make an interview recording that would feature MacLeish and Pound while Pound was advancing the idea of a similar recording that featured himself and what Caedmon saw as one of his "young disciple[s]."

[31] In a letter from Laughlin to Holdridge, which was dated July 6 1959 and which was made as a preliminary Caedmon's first Pound LP, Laughlin advises Holdridge: "This contract does not cover the tapes which you made once when you visited Ezra at St. Elizabeth's Hospital in Washington. You can, however, if you wish, put in some sort of option clause on that material."

[32] Disposition of Marianne Mantell, pp. 566-572.

[33] Gielgud would turn out to be an important figure in the history of the Caedmon enterprise and in the company that Mantell ran with her husband, Films for the Humanities. However, the actor was also an important figure in the life of Eliot. It was after listening to a recording of the actor reading Eliot's "Journey of the Magi" at school, that the fourteen-year old Valerie Fletcher embarked upon a quest to meet the poet. As Valerie Fletcher later recalled an interview in *The Observer*, published on Feb. 20, 1972: When I was 14 John Gielgud's recording of *The Journey of the Magi* was played to me at school [1947]. I was overwhelmed. I remembered an intense excitement, as though a bomb had exploded under me. I knew something had happened, I knew that something was different. After that I found out all I could about T.S. Eliot. My obsession became a family joke . . . . I told people I wanted to work with T.S. Eliot and they advised me to do a secretarial course, so I came to London. My parents were against it, but I was so much wanting to get to Tom." Less than three years after hearing that record, Fletcher achieved her goal.

[34] Marianne Roney, unpublished letter to Peter du Sautoy, February 14 1955.

[35] Elizabeth Drew, unpublished letter to Miss Roney and Miss Cohen, May 21 1956.

[36] Several recordings of Eliot reading *The Waste Land* were lodged in the Library of Congress. Eliot recorded the poem specifically for the Library of Congress Recording Laboratory Project in 1946. A 1935 acetate disc recording of Eliot was housed at the Brander Matthews Dramatic Voice Museum archive at Columbia University. Eliot also recorded the work at the NBC sound studios in 1946 for the purposes of its

---

educational program *The University of the Air*. Any of these recordings may have formed the original that Caedmon subsequently copied. Mantell remembers only that the recording was obtained from the Library of Congress.

[37] Sitwell did not perform her signature poem on her own earlier Caedmon album. However, the poem had been included on the privately recorded set issued by The Writers Group of the Society for Cultural Relations between the Peoples of the British Commonwealth and the USSR. This non-commercial recording venture clearly shows the redeployment of poetry as read aloud and as broadcast in the voiced modality from an anti-fascist wartime cultural politics to the anticommunist cultural politics of the Cold War and forms a kind of pre-history to Caedmon's own commercial enterprise. See David Mason, liner notes, *Great Literary Figures: Legends of the 20th Century,* CD, London: EMI, 1999.

[38] This poem was not recorded during the Bartók recording session and was not included in the several drafts of contracts that proceeded that session. Unpublished correspondence surrounding the re-issue of the *Treasury* during the Raytheon era when Holdridge and Mantell were no longer with Caedmon suggests that Caedmon may have signed a contract only ex post facto upon the twenty-five year anniversary issue of the recording.

Chapter Three
Cold War Cultural Crusade and "The Second Face of 'Modernism'"

While the *Treasury* was an idea whose time had come, it was also undertaken at least partially in response to the Adult Education movement which was so much a part of the Cold War reading crusade of the 1950s. The *Treasury* was not merely a mass culture commodity, nor was it merely an educational aid: instead, it was an artifact of Cold War politicization of culture and the politicization of reading more narrowly, especially in the context of the Adult Education movement.[1] This anthology is at the scene of postmodern, then, not only because it involved *read texts* on LP as a supplement to print but also because it was produced in conjunction with the Ford Foundation sponsored adult reading program *Discovering Modern Poetry*. In this chapter, I explore Caedmon's mediation of literary modernism as a commercial publisher of the spoken word in light of its direct and indirect connections to various ideological agencies that were involved in a politicized phenomenon of media shift that can be framed as "art cult" and "author cult," which was part of Cold War cultural politics.

Essentially, *read* and *spoken text* recording reflected the politicization and commodification of reading as a symbolic commodity during a moment of media shift from a culture of reading to a culture of secondary or technologized listening. The politicization of reading was only one aspect of America's Cold War cultural crusade, as part of a broader politicization and mass-dissemination of American culture that was arguably even more prominent internationally than it was within America. This mass-mediated crusade was the product of the social aging of wartime media systems as supplemented by the anti-communist crusade to project American culture abroad in the service of promoting democracy, capitalism and modernization, and more narrowly in the service of projecting the idea that Americans were both a spiritual and a cultured people. The legacy of this crusade to sell culture—but also democracy and capitalism—is essentially the origin of postmodern culture. This larger publicity apparatus also conditioned the reproduction of "modernism" as the content of postmodern media systems.

Because modernism had been proven to be anti-totalitarian—both anti-fascist and anti-Stalinist—it had had a particular contingency of value as the content of postmodern mass media and of postmodern media systems. This chapter details how Caedmon's production of "the second face of Modernism" was shaped by different forms of non-commercial ideological production in ways that relate to America's larger Cold War reading and cultural crusades. More narrowly, I argue that the Caedmon catalogue was one of the mechanisms that produced the postmodern as a globally distributed or universal "popular" mass culture. Central to my argument that Caedmon Records is the scene of the postmodern, then, is the composition and continuing evolution of the Caedmon catalogue. As a mechanism of cultural mediation, the Caedmon catalogue articulated the sound recording and print publishing industries. It also functioned to articulate *read texts* with other mass media cultures, including the film and radio industries, and with non-commercial programs of postmodern ideological inscription that operated within America and globally.

The diversification of the Caedmon catalogue consolidated in 1956, shortly after Caedmon was formally incorporated. A manifestation of this diversification involved the production of *spoken text* documents that fell within the purview of the postmodern humanities and the postmodern or spoken liberal arts. One project that illustrated the turn to *spoken text* recordings as a supplement to *read text* recordings of contemporary literature was an Ancient Greek language recording made by Pearl Wilson, a Hunter College instructor. Wilson was recorded reading Greek epic and lyric poetry, including short excerpts from the *Iliad* and *The Odyssey*, "Allegory of the Cave" as an excerpt from Plato's *The Republic* and Sappho's *Hymn to Aphrodite*. Wilson also recorded a second disc that contained excerpts of the works of Socrates, which was later combined with the first under the title *The Golden Treasury of Greek Poetry and Prose*, and wrote the liner notes that framed these recordings.

This album was at the scene of the postmodern humanities in that it involved the appropriation of mass media in the service of a humanistic mass education. This "re-sounding" of the classical Greek texts in postmodern mass media also reflected their aspect as the foundation of a "modern" education. Hunter College had been an important innovator in the American revival of the Humanities during wartime and in the postwar period. Wilson was only one of several faculty who were associated with the Caedmon enterprise; Helaine Newstead, whose field was Medieval and Renaissance Literature, also wrote liner notes for several recordings. Even Hunter College's President, George Shuster, also wrote liner notes—for the *spoken text* LP of Gerard Manley Hopkins that the label published in 1959.[2]

The presence of the Wilson recording in the Caedmon catalogue was a clear example of the political morality that underwrote the deployment of full sound spectrum media in the postwar period. While these LP records are evidence of a utopian attempt on Holdridge and Mantell's part to extend a humanistic education to "the common man," they also offer evidence of a kind of humanities commodity-kitsch at work within the field of spoken word recording. Such was the vogue for the popular humanities at the time that Caedmon's Atlanta distributor ordered two thousand copies of the record. Mantell cites the Wilson record as evidence of what would sell. She repeatedly stresses that this didn't mean that the people who bought Caedmon records necessarily listened to them. Chuckling about the Atlanta sales figures of Wilson's Greek language recording, she notes: "There is no way that people listened to those—because the whole market in America wasn't that big!"

The five-volume *Cambridge Treasury of English Prose*, which featured members from Cambridge University reading excerpts from selections of British historical prose from periods that spanned from the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries, was also released that year. The album involved a different materialization of the political morality of mass media as mass education. On the one hand, the project to record Cambridge lecturers and to make these recordings available to a larger public was in keeping with the earliest educational recording projects in Britain, in which Cambridge University was historically a major pioneer. On the other hand, the *Cambridge Treasury* was produced under the auspices of the British Arts Council as an ideological state apparatus that extended elite or minority culture to the so-called "common man" as part of the politics of obtaining cultural consensus within the United Kingdom and which secondarily promoted British culture and the British way of life abroad. In this sense, the anthology represented an articulation between Caedmon and the British ideological organ in its aspect as a publicity apparatus that operated internationally.

These early experiments aside, Caedmon did not specialize in recordings that featured educators. The main genres that supplemented *read text* poetry recordings were *spoken text* recordings of historical poetry and prose as undertaken by actors. Both genres—*read texts* and *spoken texts*—were part of America's broader mass-mediated reading and cultural crusade. That crusade was not merely a phenomenon of media shift. Rather, it was discursively and institutionally mediated as part of the broader scene of postwar mass culture. In this chapter, I recover the foundational discourse that set the scene for the appropriation of mass media in the service of mass culture and mass education before examining some of the major institutions that were involved in the material production of "the second face of modernism" or modernism as the "content" of postmodern mass culture, particularly as it relates to *read* and *spoken* texts and the politicization of reading, and of the arts and letters more broadly, during the Cold War period.

Most notably, the history of postwar mass culture as a supplement to both art culture and kitsch has certain discursive prehistory that was first articulated by Greenberg in "Avant Garde and Kitsch." Published in *The Partisan Review* in September 1939, that essay was the first to formulate the kitsch/avant-garde art polarity that was characteristic of modern culture. According to Greenberg, kitsch involved ersatz culture or a mechanically produced simulation of genuine culture. Greenberg noted that the petit bourgeoisie who were alienated from artisanal folk culture consumed this industrially produced culture. Greenberg also historicized the origins of the historical avant-garde or modern art as a form of both rupture and continuity in the tradition of Western art. According to Greenberg, the preconditions of modern art—as what might be termed an autonomous sphere of ideological dissent—involved the consolidation of bourgeois capitalist culture, against which the historical avant-garde defined itself oppositionally, and the emergence of revolutionary Marxism which gave the historical avant-garde a lexicon in which to define its opposition to bourgeois aesthetics. It is important to emphasize that Greenberg maintained that there was no genuinely revolutionary political impulse in the works of the historical avant-garde. Instead, Greenberg suggested that the preservation of avant-garde art and the best of the aristocratic and bourgeois art-traditions more generally was important because kitsch leant itself so easily to propagandization by totalitarian regimes. Essentially, Greenberg argued that the bourgeois art tradition, including the works of the historical avant-garde, was politically valuable because it offered a panacea against propagandized kitsch. In doing so, Greenberg outlined an extra-aesthetic contingency of value that would condition the politicization of art in the postwar period—in its primary and in its secondary or mass-mediated modality—as a postmodern supplement to modern art and to the project of literacy and a modern education.

In a series of essays published in *The Partisan Review* in 1960, Dwight Macdonald also attempted to trace the emergence of a material phenomenon he labeled "midcult" as a third term mediating between the avant-garde/kitsch polarity. Macdonald began the second of those essays, "Masscult and Midcult II," by historicizing midcult as a technology of cultural assimilation that mediated elite and essentially Anglo-Saxon high culture in a simplified or vulgarized form to immigrants who would otherwise have consumed mass culture or kitsch. Macdonald re-framed Greenberg's contention that kitsch arose as the culture of the European urban petit bourgeoisie. Kitsch in the American context involved universal mass culture, and film in particular, as disseminated to the ethnically heterogeneous and sub-literate American underclass or the American proletariat and lumpenproletariat. It was also fundamentally a technology of cultural assimilation or "Americanization" rather than a compensation for a genuine bourgeois art culture or a lost artisanal folk culture as outlined by Greenberg. Midcult, like kitsch, was also a technology of Americanization. However, as outlined by Macdonald, midcult went from being a mechanism or technology of *ethnic* assimilation to one of *political* assimilation during the Second World War. During the same period of time, it underwent a shift from mediation by print institutions such as *The Atlantic Monthly* and the Book of the Month Club to post print mediation. Macdonald also identified the institutions that were producing midcult though their mass mediation of culture. First on Macdonald's list was *Horizon: A Magazine of the Arts*, which Macdonald accurately framed as "a periodical encyclopedia, not really a magazine at all" (593). Coming in for special vitriol was Edward Steichen's "Family of Man" exhibit, which was identified by Macdonald as an especially inane form of democratic propaganda not unlike a photo spread that readers might expect to encounter in LIFE magazine (600).

Macdonald was essentially critiquing the effect of midcult on art culture. Postwar midcult was fundamentally characterized by the way that mimicked and exploited "the discoveries of the avant-garde" (605). As Macdonald noted: "Bauhaus modernism has seeped down, in a vulgarized form, into the design of our vacuum cleaners, pop-up toasters, supermarkets and cafeterias" (610). Postwar midcult was dangerous because in mediating so-called high culture it dissipated the energies of a genuine art culture. At the same time—in a thinly veiled allusion to Archibald MacLeish—Macdonald noted that it was institutionalized and politicized by figures such as "The Boylston Professor of Rhetoric"(606). While Macdonald was concerned with the reifying impact of midcult on art culture, he also critiqued its social effects. The proliferation of midcult was generating what he ambivalently saw as a "lumpenproletariat avant-garde" that did not understand the impulse behind the historical avant-garde but who was appropriating its forms and thus contributing to their so-called vulgarization (613).

In "The Institutionalization of Revolt, The Domestication of Dissent," poet Kenneth Rexroth explicitly framed these recuperating processes as commodification and institutionalization. In that 1963 essay, Rexroth was concerned with discriminating "modernisms" or "avant-gardisms" and in distinguishing their historical situatedness from the ways in which they had been recuperated. Rexroth's periodicization and definition of modernism underscored a crisis of belief that arose in the aftermath of the First World War. According to Rexroth, modernism was by its very nature a revolt of sons and daughters of the bourgeoisie, and particularly the grande or haute bourgeoisie, against the whole structure of liberal humanitarianism in the aftermath of that conflict. Rexroth saw a fundamental difference between this historical "modernism" and the "modernism" of the postwar period. Essentially, Rexroth was outlining the collapse of the aura or historical situatedness of modern art. Like Macdonald, he suggested that this collapse was achieved by its commodification as kitsch—implicitly in the form of technical translation into media of reproduction—and secondly as the result of institutionalization. At the same time, Rexroth noted that a commodified and institutionalized "modernism" as a simulation of dissent displaced the possibilities for a dissent rooted in the present. For Rexroth, universally disseminated modernism was also a form of "pseudo-alienation" that served to co-opt or convert the American lumpen-proletariat into a kind of "lumpen bourgeoisie" and "lumpenintellegentsia." It was dangerous, then, because it was ideologically transformative.

Like Macdonald, Rexroth isolated many of the institutions that were involved in the recuperation of modernism as a universally distributed mass culture. These included Madison Avenue ad agencies and "the Yale Man or Time editor" (197). Rexroth also began his essay with a biographical account of his own experience of being approached by an agent from the MCA theatrical agency "who was trying to sign me up with the firm as a package—entertainer, lecturer, writer, TV personality, maybe actor" (197.) Rexroth was essentially critiquing the transformation of the writer into a media personality or mass mediated commodity image. Finally, Rexroth detailed interpenetration between the commodification and mediation of modernism with its institutionalization by educational and ideological organizations such as City College of New York (CCNY) and UNESCO. In particular, he assailed the dissemination of modernism as the content of postmodern media systems that were legitimated by UNESO, and which had a very different disposition than that of modernism itself. As Rexroth noted:

> The nihilism and disorder . . . which arose from the broken heart of Europe in 1918 has become a gimmick, peddled in all the academies of the world, a do-it-yourself kit complete with instruction book in thirty languages and pictographs for the boys with rising expectations who haven't mastered any alphabet as yet. In 1918 the price was a broken heart. Today it doesn't cost a thing; it is one of perquisites – or is it prerequisites? – of the Welfare State. Drop a card to UNESCO. (203)

Essentially, Rexroth was noting the emergence of post print and paranational systems of postmodern ideological inscription as supplements to modern art and to literacy and the project of modern education. However, Rexroth appears to have been largely insensitive to the cultural politics of mass mediation globally, including the spectacularization of "dissent" in the global context.

However, those in non-American cultural locations—and from a greater historical distance—were able to recognize and theorize this new form of midcult more effectively specifically in relation to the discourses of modernism and post-modernism. In *After the*

Great Divide: Modernism, Mass Culture, Postmodernism, Andreas Huyssen disturbed a distinction between modernism and postmodernism that rested upon their supposedly different engagements with mass culture. Huyssen pointed to a longstanding interpenetration between the works of the historical avant-gardes and mass-produced culture that disturbed the minority/mass culture or art/kitsch polarity that is seen as commonly seen as the ground of modernism. Huyssen suggested that the work of Wagner might be fruitfully revisioned as a type of postmodernism, for example. At the same time, Huyssen historically delimited modernism, or the works of the historical avant-garde, as extending from 1870 to 1930. Significantly, he sourced the demise of the historical avant-garde not in the triumph of commercial mass culture, or kitsch, but rather in that of fascism and Stalinism. Even as Huyssen disturbed a clear-cut distinction between modernism and postmodernism as historically delimited cultural formations, he attempted to recover a historical period that mediated between the demise of modernism, circa 1930, and the emergence of postmodernism recognized as such in the early 1970s. Deconstructing Huyssen's argument—or reading his three terms chronologically against the grain—one arrives at the so-called "mass culture" of the postwar period as a historically delimited period of cultural history.

Huyssen was fundamentally a historian of the "Great Divide" as a discursive construct that conditioned the deployment of mass culture during the mid twentieth-century (viii). Essentially, Huyssen suggested that the polarized discourse of high and low culture consolidated at two historical junctures. These occurred during the last decade of the nineteenth-century and the first few years of the twentieth and "then again in the two decades or so following World War II" (viii). Positing the Great Divide as a discursive construct, Huyssen argued for recognition of the dialectical relationship between mass culture and avant-gardism. At the same time, he created a discursive space in which to examine the historicity of postwar "mass culture" as it related to the material history or trajectory of modernism and the prehistory of postmodernism. Following the insights of West German novelist and playwright Peter Weiss (whose *Marat/de Sade* was recorded by Caedmon) Huyssen suggested that the works of the historical avant-gardes were turned into "a tool of the hard-core liberalism of the Cold War period" (136). Although Huyssen didn't explicitly frame it as such, the discourse of the Great Divide clearly underwrote the deployment of minority culture or so-called mass culture in the postwar period as a contingency of value even as postwar mass culture simultaneously effectively collapsed that divide in material terms.

Raymond Williams was also concerned with discriminating between different forms of "modernisms" as these related to mass culture, particularly in relation to a phenomenon that he labeled "the two faces of 'Modernism.'" In the posthumously published lectures that were collected in *The Politics of Modernism*, Williams described those two faces as "those innovative forms which destabilized the fixed forms of an earlier period of bourgeois society, but which were then in their turn stabilized as the most reductive versions of human existence in the whole of cultural history" (130). According to Williams, the first of "the two faces of 'Modernism'" corresponded to modernism in its own historical moment, which Williams tentatively dated as extending from 1890 to 1940, while "the second face of Modernism'" consisted of the universally distributed "popular" modernism of the postwar period.

For Williams, more important than the postwar academic canonization of a selectively recuperated "modernism" was the "popularization" of its deep forms in film, television and heavily marketed books, or the cultural politics of its mass mediation. Explicit in his discussions was a mid-century media shift. In those late lectures, Williams also retrospectively analyzed the penetration of regional and national space, including politically closed areas, by electronic mass communication technologies that disseminated universal mass culture. Under Williams' scrutiny, universally distributed mass culture—including the second face of modernism—effectively became PR for achievements of capitalism during the postwar period when it was effectively weaponized as part of the cultural politics of the Cold War. As a result of institutional and technical mediation: "Modernism quickly lost its anti-bourgeois stance, and achieved comfortable integration into the new international capitalism" (35).

Williams suggested modernism as a universally distributed 'minority' culture was essential in legitimating both capitalism and conditioning the audiences to the routines of mass or technologized culture even as they consumed what appeared to be a minority art as the "content" of technologies of mass communication and postwar mass media. He also examined the insertion of an ideological subject in this process of cultural mediation.

In particular, Williams suggested that the so-called "global village," as what might be termed the postmodern media ecology, was fundamentally flawed by the ideological insertion of a "homogenized humanity" into the medium of communication. As he noted:

> What was being addressed was a real development of universal distribution and of unprecedented opportunities for genuine and diverse cultural exchange. What was ideologically inserted was a model of homogenized humanity consciously served from two or three centres: the monopolizing corporations and the elite metropolitan intellectuals . . . . The real forces which produced both, not only in culture but in the widest areas of social, economic, and political life, belong to the dominant capitalist order in its paranational phase. But this was an enemy which could not be named because its money was being taken. (132)

Williams was referring to interpenetration of cultural entrepreneurship and paranational ideological production that supplemented the productions of the BBC and the Arts Council as British ideological apparatuses. Williams did not render the institutional matrices of that supplemental ideological formation transparent. However, he noted that a universally distributed popular "modernism" was its most distinguishing characteristic.

Switching from the discourse of cultural materialism to that of cultural history, one might track the shift outlined by these different critics in relation to specific institutions that were involved in the production of midcult, mass culture, and the second face of Modernism. These include the British Arts Council and the United States Information Agency and, less directly, the Congress of Cultural Freedom as various types of ideological apparatuses. However, it also includes commercial print publishers that reproduced Modern Library "discourse" including Random House, Anchor Books and New Directions; Caedmon as a voice publisher; and numerous periodical publications. The interpenetration between these two fields of cultural production—one ideological and one commercial—and the complex chains of intermediation between them is essentially the scene of the postwar postmodern.

Caedmon's ties to the first of these ideological organs, the British Arts Council, were first in evidence in the 1956 publication of *The Cambridge Treasury of British Prose*. The Arts Council is widely seen as an ideological apparatus that produced cultural consensus within Great Britain; in this sense, it is on a continuum with other British ideological apparatuses such as the educational system or the BBC. It is less widely known that the Council also had the objective of promoting British culture abroad and that this international mandate preceded its national objectives within the UK. The postwar postmodern was fundamentally characterized by a dialectic between the Arts Council as an organization devoted to revitalizing the fine and performing arts as "technologies" of British national and imperial identity, and by the USIA and American entrepreneurial institutions that were devoted to disseminating mass-mediated culture on a global scale in the service of Americanization. For her part, Mantell concedes that the Arts Council was what she terms "a propaganda agency." Yet she also maintains that there was a place for Arts Council-generated product in the Caedmon catalogue. To some extent, this spirit of accommodation reflected the system of cultural and educational exchange that constituted the broader scene of postmodern Cold War culture.

Even as the Caedmon and Arts Council relationship would later be characterized by a certain degree of rivalry and competition, Caedmon's relationship with the Arts Council was also initially facilitated by the friendship they enjoyed with Eve Denison, the Head of the Council's Recorded Sound Division. Mantell in particular felt "an instant rapport" with Denison. So close was this rapport that according to Mantell: "Five minutes after we met, she said, 'I don't know exactly how to ask you this, but would you—?'" Mantell replied: "If it happens again, send your daughter and I will take care of her." As Mantell recalls fifty years later: "It was a very short time after the war. Eve didn't have to say anything." Denison was elliptically referring to the perceived threat of a Soviet invasion of Britain. Foremost in the minds of many of the cultural Cold Warriors involved in the universalization of the "Western" art tradition—which also represented its propagandization to some extent—was the perceived threat of Soviet imperialism in the Stalin and the Khrushchev eras. However, Mantell's invitation also indicates that the shadow of the Holocaust was implicated in the moral imperative to publish a universal culture in the postwar period.

The ideological battle for the "hearts and minds" of citizens of the so-called free world needs to be contextualized not only against the residual appeal of Comintern's program of Stalinism in the arts internationally, then, but more importantly in relation to conditions *within* the Soviet Union and particularly with regard to Stalin's "anti-cosmopolitan" campaign against universalism in the Arts and the Humanities, which began with the onset of the Cold War in 1947 and which took an anti-Semitic turn beginning in 1949 (Azadovskii and Egorov 66-79). The legacy of Stalin's anti-cosmopolitan campaigns—in which dozens if not hundreds of Jewish intellectuals in the fields of the Arts and the Humanities are believed to have been murdered—clearly shaped the cultural politics of the Cold War in ways that transcended the ideological element of that conflict. The triumph of communism worldwide would have meant not only the triumph of communism over capitalism but also the end of art; equally importantly, it raised the horrifying possibility of a revival of a virulent form of anti-Semitism in the shadow of the Holocaust.

Even as the Arts Council and Caedmon shared certain broad ideological objectives, their relationship was underwritten by conventional business arrangements, however. Despite the early warmth between Caedmon and the Council, that relationship soured a short time later when the Arts Council began to make deals with Caedmon's British imitator Argo, which had been founded specifically to compete with Caedmon. Correspondence indicates that by March of 1957, relations were already strained with the Arts Council because Caedmon had spent some $5,000 for artwork for the *Cambridge Treasury*—and some $2,500 on the Cambridge University books that were to accompany the five-record set—only to find out that the Arts Council intended to limit Caedmon's right to distribute the series to North America. This arrangement earned Caedmon's ire as the record company had provisionally estimated that fully half of the market for this series would originate from outside North America. In other words, Caedmon was more than happy to publish Arts Council product but it wanted both the American and the global market for that product. Despite Holdridge and Mantell's insistence during interviews with me that Caedmon was almost exclusively a North American interest, correspondence such as this indicates that secondary foreign markets were important.[3]

Like Great Britain, America had its own ideological apparatuses. The United States Information Agency—which combined cultural, educational, and informational or communicative apparatuses—was the clearest analogue to the combined Arts Council/BBC apparatus. The USIA was founded during the first year of Dwight

Eisenhower's presidency as the result of Senator McCarthy's purging the Voice of America and the United States Information Service, or USIS, both of which were organs of the American State Department. USIS was a Truman-era paranational informational apparatus that had been founded to "promote better understanding of the United States abroad and to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries" (Henderson 64). It was based on a "campaign of truth" or information, as disseminated in USIS libraries and over the VOA.[4] In contrast, the USIA was based on the international dissemination of mass culture, and secondarily on programs of active cultural exchange. The USIA had eight explicit ideological themes that were to be developed in all of USIA materials. These included the principles that "Americans are nice people," "America is generous and altruistic" and that "America is democratic." They also included the theme that "Americans believe in freedom for other people," that "American life has a spiritual quality," and that "Americans are a cultured people." Finally, they included the principles that "the U.S. economy is successful" and that "America is a peaceable country" (Bogart 89-90). The USIA, then, was essentially a cultural supplement to USIS as an informational apparatus. Theme five underwrote the deployment of America's Cold War reading crusade and its mass-mediated Cold War cultural crusade. Theme six was even more important. In its entirety, it read:

> Americans are cultured people. The U.S. has art, ballet, and a creative cultural life; there are serious books available at prices that people can afford; we have writers of noted achievement and a young but developing literary tradition. (90)

In their aggregate, these principles underwrote the projection of American culture abroad—including the second face of Modernism.

There are close parallels between the USIA's informational and cultural apparatus and the BBC/Arts Council, but there are also important differences between them. One of the most important of these involved the fact that the Arts Council sponsored materials intended for British audiences as part of the political project of producing cultural consensus within Britain. In contrast, the USIA was prohibited from publishing materials for distribution within the continental United States. The USIA also had a more heterogeneous media apparatus. One of its most important elements was the *Voice of*

America radio network. USIA sponsored international film productions (and later television productions) were extremely important in the European context; documentary films in particular were also important in the Latin American context (Fein 400-450). Another key part of the USIA apparatus involved its international network of cultural centers and libraries. The USIA also had a significant book publishing and periodical publications apparatus that was achieved largely in cooperation with American and international print publishers.[5] The USIA budget also included an exhibition and trade fairs component.

Overall, the USIA represented the propagandization and even weaponization of culture and information through mass mediation. This weaponization reached its fullest expression during the Reagan era and likely forms the immediate stimulus behind the series of lectures that constituted *The Politics of Modernism.*[6] The USIA had radically different dispositions during Democratic and Republican administrations, however. There was a re-liberalizing of the USIA during the Kennedy and Johnson administrations. The Kennedy era in particular was marked by the addition of the educational component, in the form of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 or the Fullbright-Hays Act. It was at this juncture that mass-mediated culture and information were supplemented by programs of active educational exchange.

There are a number of connections between Caedmon and the USIA, particularly in the early years. However, it is uncertain whether the USIA is the indirect "origin" of some of Caedmon's recording projects or whether the catalogue of the commercial recorder was merely imitating the poets and authors—whether American or foreign—in whom the USIA also had an interest. It seems likely that a cultural exchange program facilitated the *Compañía Española de Teatro Universal* recordings given that Barcelona was the location of one of only two of the USIA's bi-national cultural centers in Europe, for example. Connections between Caedmon and USIA also seem to have been facilitated by Archibald MacLeish's early support of Caedmon. In particular, there are hints of a close affiliation between Caedmon and the USIS/USIA in some of the "missing" recordings that constitute part of the broader history of the Caedmon recording venture, including the recording of Pound reading Provençal poetry that was made on the grounds of St. Elizabeth's in 1952 and another recording of the Chilean poet—and ardent pan-Americanist—Gabriela Mistral.[7] There also appears to have been an occasional "criss-cross" between USIA sponsored culture and Caedmon's commercial voice documents, which is perhaps natural given that Mantell married an independent filmmaker who produced documentaries for the USIA in 1956.[8] While Caedmon recorded cummings before Harold Mantell made a USIA documentary about the poet intended for international distribution, Caedmon's partners met others who recorded for Caedmon—such as the Ukrainian dissident Yevgeny Yevtushenko—directly through Harold Mantell.[9]

This complex chain of intermediation was characteristic of Cold War culture, which generally involved a certain "criss-cross" between the fields of commercial and non-commercial cultural production. In publicizing the achievements of American culture and civilization, for example, the Voice of America played recordings produced by America's record companies including Caedmon and others. During the Johnson era, the VOA was also prominently associated with the dissemination of modern American poetry. Perhaps the clearest expression of that commitment were the *Voice of America Forum Lectures* on American poetry which were undertaken in 1965, under the direction of Howard Nermerov who was then Poetry Consultant to the Library of Congress. These featured American poets discussing their works including Marianne Moore, Conrad Aiken, Richard Wilbur, Richard Eberhart, Robert Duncan, Gregory Corso and others.[10] These kinds of parallels do not undermine the fact that Caedmon was an independent commercial record company. The connection between Caedmon and the USIA was not a strong as that between Argo and the British Arts Council, for example.

At the same time, turns in the Caedmon catalogue seem have generally paralleled the changing objectives of the USIA, including its turn from American civilization to American popular culture in the late 1950s. In particular, Caedmon's commitment to Carl Sandburg suggests a possible USIA link.

In recording Sandburg, Caedmon was clearly departing from its mandate to record the best of twentieth-century literature. Mantell justifies their decision to record Sandburg, by noting: "He was a big name." Holdridge suggests that Sandburg was one of the few poets known to Caedmon's audiences during this period of time. As she recalls: "They knew Sandburg's *Lincoln Memorial* as Copland had interpreted it. They knew his children's and popular stories." Fittingly, Caedmon began by publishing *read text* recordings of Sandburg's *Rootabega Stories* and *Poems for Children,* as followed by the two-disc set *Carl Sandburg Reading a Lincoln Album,* which was published in 1958. In publishing the latter, Holdridge and Mantell were memorializing the wartime mobilization against fascism within America. Simultaneously, they were also mediating Sandburg in a way that clearly evoked the rhetoric of the USIA. Indeed, USIA discourse cohered so closely around Sandburg that after the poet's death he was specifically eulogized as "the voice of America" by President Johnson (Callaghan 239).

It is important to acknowledge that Sandburg was arguably active in more media modalities at the mid twentieth century than any other poet before or since. In addition to being a popular folk singer and children's author, Sandburg was also a nationally syndicated print columnist for *The Chicago Daily News.* Some of his weekly print editorials had played a role in generating support for America's entry in the war. As part of the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies, the poet also addressed Americans via the airwaves that same topic; one of these addresses included an occasion where he urged Americans to re-elect the President on the eve of Election Day, in November of 1940, by implicitly comparing Roosevelt to Lincoln (Callaghan 118). Sandburg was ubiquitous in his service to the OWI during wartime in ways that exceeded his journalistic activities and his engagement with the medium of radio. Along with Albert Einstein, Thomas Mann, Henri Bergson and Harold Laski, he also wrote a book entitled *Freedom: Its Meaning* under the direction of Archibald MacLeish (Fussell 172-5). Contemporaries, then, likely recognized Sandburg first and foremost as an ideologue who paid tribute to democracy and the American way of life.

That engagement began with Sandburg's 1936 poem *The People, Yes,* which revived the ideals of nineteenth-century popular democracy. The publication Sandburg's prose biography of Lincoln represented a deeper engagement with democratic ideals. Widely lauded as one of the master biographies of the twentieth century, Sandburg's treatment was the first to take the life of the American president as its subject. Harcourt Brace *published Abraham Lincoln: The Prairie Years* in 1923; *Abraham Lincoln: The War Years* took Sandburg ten years to write and was published only in 1939. The first edition of 29,000 four-volume sets sold out within months (Callaghan 76). Sandburg's treatment of the life of Lincoln formed a part of the cultural history when the war broke out. Given the clear moral analogues between slavery and Nazism, Lincoln became a sign in the popular imagination of the revival of the potential popular democracy in the face of the political threat posed by totalitarian governments and that posed by fascism in particular.

Sandburg's engagement with the life of Lincoln was widely mimicked. His treatment influenced Aaron Copland, who set the work to music. Robert E. Sherwood, the playwright and *Vanity Fair* editor who was the head of the Overseas Division of the OWI, subsequently wrote a stage play based on the life of Lincoln (Callaghan 84). If Lincoln effectively became a cultural icon around which American liberals and antifascists rallied, it is important to note that this rally was often staged in media of secondary orality rather than print media *per se*. This tactic was clearly a dialectical response that was shaped by the fascists' instrumentalization of radio and secondary voice media.

Sandburg's efforts as an ideologue clearly transcended any single medium, however. Along with his brother-in-law the photographer Edward Steichen, Sandburg was part of two key photographic exhibitions that celebrated the democratic American way of life which were first mounted at MOMA. *Road to Victory* involved an exhibition of 150 iconographic images of America and portraits of Americans at war. It opened in May of 1942 and later toured the United States, Britain and South America. Sandburg also compiled the captions that were used at the *Family of Man* exhibit, which was arguably the key photographic ideological exhibit of the Cold War. Steichen, who was incidentally also the illustrator of Eisenhower's memoir *Crusade in Europe*, curated that exhibit. Sandburg wrote the prologue to MOMA's 1955 publication of the same name and accompanied Steichen when the exhibition was mounted in Moscow in the summer of 1959 as part of the six-week American National Exhibition celebrating the achievements of American capitalism and Western consumer culture as sponsored by the American State Department and the United States Information Agency (Callaghan 224, Hixson 185-213).

Caedmon's retrospective position as Sandburg's voice publisher from 1957 forward is tantalizing to consider given these multiple associations. The persistent association of Sandburg with so-called radio propaganda is hard to shake in particular, and persists even in the circumstances that grounded Caedmon's first recording of Sandburg. As Mantell recalls: "We got him [Sandburg] through the guy who wrote radio plays." Mantell is referring to Norman Corwin, the author of *This is War!* (the first radio series to air after the bombing of Pearl Harbor) (Horton 61-2). Corwin was personal friend of the Mantells who also played a role in introducing the poet to Hollywood around the same time (Callaghan 225-30). Sandburg was also a key figure in mass-mediated "crusade" discourse given his work as a scriptwriter for *The Greatest Story Ever Told* as a Hollywood adaptation of the Bible.

Caedmon's commitment to Sandburg remained strong over the years. *Carl Sandburg Reading His Poetry* was released in 1962. The label released a recording of Sandburg reading from his autobiography *Always the Young Strangers* in 1966 and subsequently returned to Sandburg in 1967 with *Carl Sandburg Sings His American Songbag* and a recording of Sandburg reading *The People, Yes*. In 1968, Caedmon released *Carl Sandburg Reading Fog and Other Poems*.[11] In all, Caedmon released ten recordings of Sandburg, reflecting a position of considerable prominence in the Caedmon catalogue as a whole.

If the USIA represented the United States' overt international ideological apparatus, its covert Cold War ideological apparatus was the CIA-sponsored Congress of Cultural Freedom. While the USIA favored mass culture, the CCF politicized art and letters more narrowly. According to Frances Stonor Saunders, the CIA operated the CCF from 1950 to 1967 as part of "a secret program of cultural propaganda in Western Europe" (1). The CCF was an institution dedicated to cultural containment in that the purpose of the CCF was to persuade Western Europe's left leaning intelligentsia to the cause of democracy. To that end, the CCF spectacularized the achievements of American culture and American civilization, and the position of the arts and letters within a democratic society more generally. According to Stonor Saunders, the CCF was initially enabled by a diversion of funds from the Marshall Plan—amounting to about 200 million dollars a year—as supplemented by extensive support from America's cultural foundations (105-6, 135).

While the CCF network included performance, exhibition and broadcasting networks, its primary modalities of dissemination were Cold War presses and Cold War periodicals, or what Stonor Saunders refers to as CIA's "world family of magazines" (332).[12] Foundation-sponsored journals of U.S. origin targeting international audiences were a particularly prominent part of the CCF apparatus. One of the most prominent of these was the Ford Foundation sponsored Intercultural Publications, which was directed by New Directions' publisher James Laughlin (140). Among other periodicals, that organ published *Perspectives* as a journal devoted to disseminating modern and contemporary American writing in France, England and Germany. These journals effectively mediated the American avant-garde, including the literary avant-garde, for international audiences. In this sense, they represented a certain historical supplement to modernist print culture.[13] The influence of the CCF was not limited to its family of periodicals as a publishing formation that effectively functioned as a publicity apparatus. Even when not directly linked to the CCF, Cold War print presses including New Directions were prominent in the publication of dissident CP writers in the West, for example. Similarly, CCF-sponsored Cold War presses printed over one thousand translations of books intended for international audiences, which presumably had some ideological contingency of value—including most notably Eliot's *The Waste Land* and *Four Quartets* (Stonor Saunders 245).

These forms of covert ideological non-commercial publishing were in fact deeply imbricated with postwar commercial publishing. However, even within the field of commercial publishing, the proliferation of the legacy of modern writing as a sphere of dissent appears to have served the discourse of "cultural freedom" in that it spectacularized the relative freedom that writers enjoyed within a democracy. This politicization is best exemplified by the proliferation of Modern Library authors whose works had been banned at some point in the American context. In this way, modernist literature ironically became an emblem of democracy and the right to express "dissent." Debates about censorship *within* America or the freedom to read in the early 1950s had soon been displaced onto CP countries including Yugoslavia, Poland and the USSR.[14] However, the politicization of the "freedom to write" more narrowly may have reached its fullest expression in the furor that arose of the awarding of the Nobel Prize to Boris

Pasternak in 1958. As a result of winning that prize, Pasternak was denounced by Krushchev, ejected from the Soviet Writer's Union and narrowly escaped exile. Pasternak's case was widely championed by the CCF. Subsequently, Pasternak became a sign that was widely proliferated in popular mass media. Caedmon's rival, Spoken Arts, released an album called *Poems from Dr. Zhivago* in the spring of 1959. Folkways also recorded Russian language *spoken text* Pasternak album around the same time. Caedmon joined the fray only in 1966—albeit with Russian language *spoken text* recording performed by Yevgeny Yevtushenko.

Caedmon recorded a number of figures who were prominently associated with the CCF. Katherine Anne Porter, who had been a keynote speaker at the April 1952 Congress of Cultural Freedom conference in Paris, was recorded for Caedmon by an unnamed volunteer in that city shortly after that event. Auden and Faulkner were also CCF members. Caedmon also published Spender as the editor of *Encounter*, which was effectively the "flagship" of the CCF's network of cultural magazines. One of the closest connections to CCF discourse or the discourse of cultural freedom involved *Bertrand Russell Speaks* as a commercial publication of a recorded interview that the philosopher made on the BBC, which was published in 1962. In publishing Russell's voice-image, Caedmon was performing a certain sign in wider field of cultural politics. Russell was an honorary patron of the CCF and sufficiently anti-Soviet that he once advocated nuclear warfare against the Soviet Union. However, he was also a foundational figure in the earlier struggle for academic freedom *within* America.

It has not been acknowledged by Cold War cultural historians that the CCF had a historical antecedent in the American Congress of Cultural Freedom or ACCF, which was founded in 1941 specifically in response to the blocking of Russell's appointment as a visiting lecturer at the City College of New York, by religious fundamentalists and political conservatives. The CCF clearly antedates the cultural politics of the Cold War in that it originated in the internal context of the fight against the censorship of intellectual freedom *within* America.[15] Like the struggle to proliferate Modern Library authors, the project to publish Russell's voice image memorialized the fight against fascism *within* America, while simultaneously participating in anti-Soviet containment culture. This doubleness—or the diachronic evolution from American antifascism to American anticommunism—is at the heart of the discourse of cultural "freedom."

Caedmon's link with the CCF is perhaps most direct through its association with the Reader's Subscription Book Club. Caedmon had a longstanding relationship with the Book-of-the-Month Club. Mantell downplays an association with the middlebrow book club, however. As she notes: "They occasionally took a record—as an alternate or something like that—never as a main selection." Mantell cedes a much closer relationship with the more highbrow Reader's Subscription Book Club, which was much more central the politicization of reading during the Cold War. The Club founded in 1951. According to Louis Menand, Lionel Trilling founded the club at the behest of one of his students. Trilling asked fellow professor Jacques Barzun to be the second judge, who selected W.H. Auden as the third. The Club was based on the Great Books program launched by John Erskine at Columbia University in the 1920s. Trilling and Barzun had revived the Great Books Program at Columbia College as faculty members during the 1930s; both had taken the program there as undergraduates. According to Menand, that program was originally developed as part of deliberate program to "define tradition as Western and Christian and to convert students to its norms" (203). As such, it fell within the purview of America's Cold War reading crusade.

Caedmon's business correspondence reveals a very close association between the record company and the Club. Mantell herself underscores this relationship although that association seems to have been downplayed by both Barzun and Trilling. In several different reviews excerpted in Krystol's history of the club, Trilling distanced himself from the very recordings that his organization was promoting. In one such review, for example, Trilling wrote: "I have maintained a long resistance to the growing tendency to make poetry a thing of the ear, the platform, and the record-player, rather than a thing of the book and the mind"(as quoted in Menand 204). Although Barzun was much less opposed to spoken word recordings—to the extent that he recorded an album that was entitled *The Care and Feeding of the Mind* for Caedmon's rival, Spoken Arts, in 1957—he too downplayed the association of the Club with Caedmon. Speaking of Barzun's memoirs as excerpted in *The American Scholar,* Mantell recalls: "Barzun mis-remembered the use of recordings, which were important to them because they sold a lot!

This was a highbrow—and we gave them highbrow recordings—but a small club, because there are not a lot of people who join highbrow clubs." As Mantell insists indignantly: "We were a major source of income for them!"

Despite Mantell's insistence on the commercial connections between Caedmon and the Club, there is some question as to whether the Club was ever a commercial enterprise. Menand clearly suggests that it was not. Instead, he links the Club to the ACCF and cites as evidence that fact that Arnold Bernhard later became the club's publisher before it folded in 1963. (According to Menand, Sol Stein, the former executive director of the American Committee for Cultural Freedom, secured Bernhard's co-operation.)[16] Caedmon's business correspondence seems to suggest that that the Club benefited from an unusual discounting arrangement with Caedmon and that this arrangement was often a source of friction between Caedmon and the poets and authors that the label recorded because it resulted in discounts of greater than 52 ½%, which resulted in minimal royalties for poets and authors. The evidence suggests that the Club may have enjoyed this arrangement because it was an instrument of Cold War cultural politics. However much writers and their agents grumbled about royalties, all—with the possible exception of Auden—appear to have participated in the Club unknowingly.

Caedmon's relationship with New Directions also connected the record company to another ideological institution that was central to Cold War cultural politics. There was a close correlation between the New Directions and the Caedmon catalogues. Early publicity for the company indicates that the two ventures were sufficiently closely linked that Caedmon LPs could be ordered directly through New Directions. The network of salesmen who sold Caedmon's catalogue of recordings to independent bookstores across America, many of whom distributed New Directions titles, was part of this connection. Both Holdridge and Mantell remember the importance of individual salesmen, and especially the contribution of John Storm, who had a large West Coast territory. As Holdridge recalls, such was Storm's belief in the Caedmon project that "he made sure that every store in his territory knew about them—and sold them." Holdridge would later recall: "He was a marvelous man, an excellent sales representative, whose contacts and whose ability to sell to stores on the West Coast opened up avenues that endured for years."[17]

Mantell also remembers that the devotion of the independent book salesmen. However, unlike Holdridge she explicitly links their motivation to the larger Cold War reading crusade of the 1950s. As Mantell recalls: "We had a number of devoted salesmen who felt, as Barbara and I did, that they were on a crusade with us. Their word, not mine . . . . They felt that they were working towards some goal, carrying the banner—and literacy and sensitivity for poets, that kind of stuff. That's what it meant in that context."

Mantell's remarks indicate that the semiotics of "crusade" were clearly associated with Caedmon but at the same time she is careful to distance Caedmon from crusade discourse. Indeed, Mantell frames Caedmon's West Coast distribution—not entirely convincingly—in terms of an alternative counter-culture by explicitly noting that Lawrence Ferlinghetti's City Lights Bookstore was one of Caedmon's earliest outlets on the West Coast.[18]

Nonetheless, the semiotics of "crusade" discourse surrounds various aspects of the Caedmon enterprise. Holdridge renders those most consistently in the related rhetoric of cultural proselytization. As she notes: "It took proselytizing individuals to reach as wide an audience as we could." Holdridge also invokes the discourse of cultural proselytization in relation to the relays involved in disseminating secondary or mass-mediated voice culture. As she recalls: "Radio stations were responsible for a great deal of the penetration of Caedmon recordings. They played *A Child's Christmas in Wales* on The Voice of America and on the Armed Forces network and a manner of stations such as WFMT and WFXC and so on. Individuals were responsible for that. Much of our success depended on proselytizing individuals." The discourse of proselytization spanned the commercial and the ideological fields of cultural production and is consistently rendered by Holdridge and Mantell in terms of the efforts of particular individuals acting independently. For example, Holdridge also recalls that a particular record store clerk at Sam Goody's, whose name she has forgotten, was also responsible for actively selling Caedmon LPs. (Goody himself, who had a standing order of fifty copies of each new Caedmon's LP, was also important in this respect.)

The majority of Caedmon's LPs were distributed in record stores across the country by the network of independent record salesmen that Mantell had established as the result of her contacts in the classical record business. Like the New Directions' salesmen, some of these were also highly motivated a sense of cultural mission. One of them, George Reimer, was particularly memorable. As Holdridge later recalled: "For George, it was . . . a labor of love. He learned about our recordings and came to us and said, 'I'd like to sell your recordings.' And he was working for another record company at the time."[19] Such was the devotion of Reimer—who later became a writer—that he sold Caedmon product without taking a commission.

Despite the efforts of these individual salesmen, penetration of the national record store and bookstore market remained a concern throughout the duration of the Caedmon enterprise. During the mid 1950s, Caedmon entered into an arrangement with Harper Brothers in order to better facilitate the penetration of the bookstore market on a national scale. Mantell remembers that the tastes and interests of "Cass" or Charles Canfield played a key role in the success of that arrangement and that Canfield, who was incidentally married to Jackie Kennedy's sister at the time, was "the only person who ever made useful ideas *re* programming" or the content of Caedmon's records. Like its relationship with New Directions, Caedmon's arrangement with Harper Brothers was facilitated by a figure who has been recognized as a prominent cultural Cold Warrior both through his work as a publisher of such works as *The God That Failed* (Stonor Saunders 64-5) and through his membership in the Fairfield Foundation, the France-America Society and the American Assembly as Cold War cultural foundations that operated internationally (Stonor Saunders 136-8, Blum 178). Although Canfield's accomplishments in American publishing cannot be reduced to this, they indicate the close relationship between the print publishing industry and cultural foundations that operated internationally throughout the Cold War era.

Cold War publishing clearly extended beyond existing models of cultural production in that it was shaped by political objectives that exceeded the binary and tripartite models of economic and cultural or symbolic capital, as elaborated by Pierre Bourdieu, in which print publishing is characterized by large-scale interests that produce industrial literature for mass audiences, based on the principle of immediate economic return; mid-size interests that are structured around the principle of long-term editorial judgment, or increasing returns over the long-term; and the "upside-down" principles of the coterie or restricted field as structured around the principle of symbolic cultural capital. Cold War publishing was underwritten by wider sense of political mission that was both anti-fascist and anti-communist—and pro-democracy—in ways that clearly echoed America's larger (mass-mediated) cultural crusade. That mission, which was the subject the ideology-critique elaborated in the 1960s and 1970s, was essentially the scene of the postmodern publishing in both print and post-print media as a supplement to the project of modern print publishing. This ideological supplement informed postwar publishing as a whole, tempering the aesthetic and economic motivations that are traditionally seen to underwrite the publishing industry.

It is important reiterate that Caedmon was a business venture—and not a front for the CCF or the USIA, however. As Holdridge insists: "We *were* a commercial venture. We sank or swam on what we could generate in revenue to continue." That Caedmon was a commercial enterprise cannot be disputed. Newsprint and periodical coverage devoted to the pair often referred to "The Girls Who Made Poetry Pay" or the "Eggheads with the Midas Touch." By 1962, the company had generated almost three million dollars in sales at the retail level; five years later, after the infusion of federal funding initiatives, it was generating seven million dollars in sales annually. However, at the same time it does not appear that Caedmon was *solely* a commercial enterprise. In an interview with me, Holdridge has acknowledged that Caedmon was part of a wider mission. When prompted about Caedmon's affiliations to other organizations, she acknowledged: "There *was* a network but it was a loose network. There were literary magazines and they were important, the literary journals, the literary colleges. Yes, there was a loose *cultural* association. And we were part of that to a certain extent." Holdridge's strong emphasis on the world "cultural" would seem to belie the possibility of an ideological affiliation. However, when prompted by my question, "You weren't just a record company?" Holdridge quickly responded: "No, we weren't just a record company." And then abruptly closed the subject.

The production of the *Caedmon Treasury of Modern Poets Reading* represented the culmination of America's Cold War Reading Crusade as it related to the dissemination of modern poetry. *Spoken texts* of actors reading historical poetry and prose, which were a much more discursive form of secondary literacy, began to dominate the Caedmon catalogue after its production. However, even as *read text* recordings became an increasingly smaller portion of the overall catalogue, Caedmon continued to publish the voice images of literary modernists. The earliest of these projects involved the quest to reproduce archival recordings of James Joyce reading from *Ulysses* and the work in progress that later became *Finnegans Wake*, which had been recorded by Sylvia Beach and C.K. Ogden in 1924 and 1929 respectively. With its production of both *read* and *spoken text* recordings of Joyce, Caedmon was essentially inserting itself into the chain of publication of Joyce's texts and of his voice image. In some sense, the spoken word recording label as a postmodern publisher supplemented the efforts of Beach as Joyce's first print publisher—and of the Modern Library/Random House as Joyce's American print publisher—and those of both Beach and C.K. Ogden as gramophone-era private and educational publishers of Joyce's voice image.

Both *read* and *spoken text* recordings of Joyce's work are effectively at the scene of postmodern publishing. However, the latter project was extraordinarily complex and was not finally achieved until 1971 during the post-acquisition era. *Spoken text* recordings of Joyce's texts, then, are more properly at the scene of postmodern publishing. The latter are effectively mechanisms of secondary literacy that stood in for the intellectual labor readers exert in decoding the author's works by sight from the printed page. They allowed Caedmon's audiences to acquire a familiarity with Joycean works that they would certainly not have acquired otherwise. In this sense, they were part of the so-called "democratization" of modernist literature within the larger context of a shift from a culture of reading to a culture of listening or a shift from small modern readership to a much larger postmodern mass audience.

Caedmon undertook several different Joyce recordings. Originally, the label appears to have envisioned a *spoken text* recording of *Ulysses* that would feature actors reading monologues of Molly and Leopold Bloom from different parts of *Ulysses*. That project was relatively straightforward. Only the permissions of the Joyce estate were required, as these passages had not been recorded before. Siobahn McKenna and E.G. Marshall were recorded reading the last chapter of *Ulysses* and sections from the "Naasicaa" chapter in November of 1956. However, from very early on Caedmon also seems to have envisioned a *spoken text* recording of the "Anna Livia Plurabelle" chapter from *Finnegans Wake*. This was considerably more complicated as permissions from C.K. Ogden were required, as Ogden had made a recording of Joyce reading the same passage. At some point, the record company also became interested not only in producing *spoken text* recordings but also in reproducing the two Beach and Ogden *read text* recordings as performed by Joyce himself.

This quest to publish Joyce's voice seems to have begun with an unexpected after hours visit to Caedmon's offices by the elderly Sylvia Beach. As Mantell recalls: "She had a sister in Connecticut. She was here to see the sister and she just came to pay a visit. That was it. There was nothing she could do for us—except that she did tell us who had a recording of James Joyce reading 'Moses in Egypt.'" Mantell's comments imply that Beach's visit was without commercial motive but correspondence between Caedmon and agents representing Beach over an extended period of time would seem to belie this. To begin with, Beach herself had made that recording of Joyce reading part of the "Aeolus" chapter of *Ulysses*. Although Beach may not have been attempting to sell Caedmon one of her remaining copies of James Joyce's 1924 HMV recording, she does appear to have been attempting to engage Caedmon in making a commercial recording that used her own earlier recording, for which she proposed to be compensated.

A March 111953 letter from Holdridge to John Sweeney of the Poetry Room at the Lamont Library at Harvard indicates that Caedmon was pursuing the possibility of recording that archival recording even at this early date. In a letter to Caedmon, dated February 28 1956, solicitors for the Joyce estate informed Caedmon that they considered the Beach recording of too poor a quality to copy; Joyce's estate then appears to have been opposed to the idea. A June 12 1956 letter from the Beach's lawyer, Richard M. Ader of the firm Greenbaum, Wolff & Ernst indicated that Caedmon was nonetheless pursuing a claim to copyright it. Beach's reliance on the firm that had successfully defended *Ulysses* against obscenity charges on behalf of Random House may have been complicated by the fact that this firm also represented Caedmon. (Morris L. Ernst, the lawyer who had defended *Ulysses* against obscenity charges on behalf of Random House, was Caedmon's lawyer while Richard Ader represented Beach.)

Beach appears to have advanced her cause through various intermediaries. By 1961, Anne Munro-Kerr of the Society of Authors had stepped in to represent Beach's interests. On February 14 1961, Munro-Kerr wrote to Cademon in order to inquire what it would be prepared to offer her for her introduction and the right to copy her record of the *Ulysses* recording. Munro-Kerr suggested that Beach might be owed a 5% royalty with an advance of $250. Through Munro-Kerr, Beach advanced the idea that a recording of Ernst giving an account of his participation in the *Ulysses* obscenity trial might also be included on the record. Essentially, Beach seems to have been proposing a documentary record, while Caedmon appears to have been interested in a *spoken text* recording that featured Joyce's own earlier *read text* recording. However, Caedmon did not come to terms with Beach while the latter was alive in part because of the uncertain copyright status of *Ulysses* in the US. It was only after her death that Caedmon copied the recording that had been bequeathed to the Sylvia Beach Collection at the University of New York, Buffalo.

Whereas Beach dropped by Caedmon's offices, Ogden proved a very different quarry. In the summer of 1957, Mantell had a chance to test Ogden's obstreperous reputation when she first approached him for permission to re-record "Anna Livia Plurabelle." Ogden agreed to meet with a representative of Caedmon and the then-pregnant Mantell headed to London. As she recalls: "Harold and I were in London and with great difficulty determined that this guy would meet with us and he would see us in the thickest part of the cigar smoke at his club. And, of course, the club did not admit women—and probably did not admit their existence. Under cover of Harold, I got in. We just walked in. Occasionally, you have to bluff your way through these things. It was clear that this rude American man and this impolite woman accompanying him were not going to be stopped by the tottering old guys who were there." Ogden surrendered his permission to record "Anna Livia Plurabelle" and Caedmon released Siobahnn McKenna and Cyril Cusack's *spoken text* performance of that passage in December 1958. Mantell's meeting did not result in acquiring permission to reproduce Ogden's recording of Joyce himself, however. It was only in 1960 when Ogden was deceased, that Caedmon began negotiating with the linguist's estate to obtain those permissions. Negotiations were only successfully concluded in 1968 and with the restriction that this recording only be available for sale in the United States and Canada.

Caedmon's interactions with Ogden are interesting to contemplate for the way that the label supplemented Ogden's earlier experiments in educational recording but also in light of the way in which postmodern publishing as a whole was indebted to the author of *Basic English.* The system of reduced English that Ogden devised, which was restricted to 850 high-frequency English words, originally served as a self-described "language machine" for internationalizing English in colonial contexts and for educating the supposedly simple-minded working classes. Basic English was widely re-deployed in the postwar era. The interpretative apparatus surrounding the *Great Books* series as originally printed in the *Encyclopedia Britannica* was written in a reduced or simple form of English that mimicked Basic. Many of the editions of American books that were distributed abroad during the postwar era were transcribed into Basic or a form of reduced English that mimicked Basic. The Voice of America network also favored a slow tempo that was explicitly styled as an electronic analogue to Basic English. Furthermore, Voice of America Lectures were sometimes published under the Basic Books imprint. Arguably, Basic English in both its printed and spoken modalities—particularly as appropriated by the USIA—is at the scene of the postmodern publishing even as wildly stylized Joycean English could not be more antithetical to it.

While the cultural politics of mediating Joyce's texts in the postwar period were key in the project of mediating dissent, ironically so was the mediation of texts by Ezra Pound. If a certain amount of mystery surrounds the circumstances in which Pound agreed to record at the U.S. Recording Studio—listed on his Caedmon LP as "the Washington office of New Directions"—it is clear that the poet determined which works were recorded. Holdridge and Mantell appear to have exercised editorial control only to the extent that they were able to divide this material into the more politically neutral works that were published on *Volume 1* in 1960 and the more inflammatory material on *Volume 2,* which was published in 1962. Perhaps because Holdridge and Mantell were anticipating a negative response to the publication of a spoken word recording by the treasonous poet, Pound's first LP featured the least polemical of the selections that the poet had recorded for the label including *Hugh Selwyn Mauberley* and his early short poems *Canticle de Sole* and *Moeurs Contemporaines.* The recording also contained Pound's performances of *Canto IV, Canto XXVI* and *Canto LXXXIV*—each of which was read by the poet in its entirety. The LP ended with the penitential couplet that formed the last two lines of *The Pisan Cantos* as an allusion to the poet's imprisonment in an iron cage in that city after Italy was occupied by Allied forces.

In contrast, *Volume 2* contained Pound's performances of two of his short lyric poems, *The Gypsy* and *The Exile's Letter*. Two of Pound's most polemical poems, *Canto XLV* and *Canto LI,* which centered on the theme of usury, were included. *Canto LXXXI*, which explores similar themes and includes a series of racist references to synagogues, Cockneys and "niggers" among other elements, was also recorded but was deemed so inappropriate for publication that Holdridge and Mantell exercised editorial control by censoring the first third of the poem, and simply picking up the recording part way through Pound's performance. The entire B-Side was given over to Pound's performance of the lengthy *Canto 99,* which had not yet been published in print form. While equally polemical, *Canto 99* reflected a more sober critique of American public administration.

If the publication of Pound's second LP reflected a commitment to the politics of "free speech" which had been so effective in the mobilization against fascism within America before Pearl Harbor, when many American fascists were openly assembling in public, few who heard Pound's *read text* recordings can fail to have been reminded of his wartime broadcasts on behalf of Mussolini. While Pound's sing-song and yet tone deaf performance style is clearly indebted to the chanting style of W.B. Yeats on an aesthetic level, his address to his secondary audiences also bears the trace of a delivery style that invokes radio propaganda and the fascists' use of radio as a medium of secondary orality. Pound's direct address to his audience—as when he didactically reads the definition of "usury" at the end of *Canto XLV*—evokes a much more visceral response when heard rather than read, for example.

Despite the comparative neutrality of the works that were included on *Volume 1*, Caedmon's business records reveal that some of Caedmon's audiences remained angry about the role of cultural workers in cooperating with and legitimating fascist regimes. One letter of violent protest, from a publisher of educational audio-visual materials who identified himself only as "P," condemned Caedmon's founders for their social irresponsibility in publishing "a willful, arrogant, vicious son-of-a bitch of a Nazi." However, despite this response and others like it Caedmon remained committed to

Pound. In general, the content of Pound's recordings seems to have been secondary to reinforcing the disposition of the LP medium and that of the Caedmon catalogue as a whole. Arguably, the content of Caedmon recordings in general was in fact secondary to the disposition of the vinyl medium itself. To phrase this value more succinctly, the medium *was* the message, or more accurately—in McLuhan's audiotactile formulation—the "massage." Such was the disposition of the LP medium that it had to the ability to neutralize the political content of particular recordings whether the content of those recordings was fascist, socialist, or anarchist in content—as in the case of several works that Dylan Thomas performed for the label.

If the politics of Caedmon's decision to publish a second album of Pound's poetry are uncertain and must remain speculative, it is important to note that the publication of that LP coincided with the release of *Carl Sandburg Reading His Poetry.* The sixth album devoted to Sandburg was the first to be devoted to his adult poetry. In addition to well known poems such "Windy City" and "Wheels of Steel," Sandburg's wartime poetry was prominently featured. The publication of Pound and Sandburg recordings in a year in which only three *read text* recordings were published suggests a kind of memorialization of cultural warfare in Caedmon's vinyl archive. Simultaneously, it demonstrates how the politics of cultural containment worked on a synchronic level in any given year. The dialogue between Pound and American liberal-democratic poets was also signaled by the inclusion of one of Sandburg's intertextual answers to Pound—in the form of his poem *Francois Villon Forgotten*—as part of liberal democratic project to contain Pound's influence.

Despite Mantell's characterization of the Caedmon/Pound relationship, correspondence between Caedmon and James Laughlin indicates that securing Pound's consent to release the recordings that were made in June of 1958 was extraordinarily difficult. On January 20 1958, Holdridge sent Robert McGregor a "standard" Caedmon contract. There is no record of New Directions response but one year after the recordings had been undertaken, Caedmon had yet to come to terms with Pound. Writing to Holdridge on July 6 1959, Laughlin outlined exactly what kind of terms Pound was requesting, which included an advance of $1500, the demand that Caedmon release a second Pound recording within eighteen months of publishing the first, that his recordings were not to be "mixed" or coupled with those of other poets without his express permission, and that no less than 5000 copies of any record of Pound's were to be pressed. Acting through Laughlin, Pound insisted that Caedmon should attempt to collect performance fees for radio broadcasts, which was not yet widely done. Arrangements with book clubs seem to have been particularly fraught. Laughlin returned to the matter no less than four times in his letter to Holdridge. Writing to Mantell on October 8 1959, Laughlin advised that he could not yet send the contracts on to Pound because "that whacky clause about a lower royalty where a 'special mailing' is involved has crept back in again." It is uncertain what "special mailing" referred to but it seems likely that this may have referred to the Reader's Subscription Book Club since other discounters do not appear to have enjoyed discounts of over 52 ½ %.

The Club seems to have been a prominent organ in disseminating the Pound recordings given the frequency with which various parties at Caedmon and New Directions returned to the matter. On February 12 1960, Laughlin wrote to Holdridge to complain about a negative advance review of the recording, which had been written by poet Delmore Schwartz for a publication called *The Griffin* and commissioned by the Club. So concerned was Laughlin about the way in which Caedmon's first LP was being framed for its potential audiences that he asked Holdridge for permission to review the copy that was intended for the notes to be used on cover of Pound's LP before it was published in the hope of "protecting" Pound.[20] The Club seems to have remained a point of persistent contention between Pound and Caedmon. A June 29 1962 letter from Herbert P. Gleason, the lawyer representing the Committee for Ezra Pound, observed that sales of the first Pound LP had fallen somewhat short of the Committee's expectations and chastised Caedmon for the fact that it was not regularly advertised in the Reader's Subscription catalogue. Mantell's frank response indicated that even with a distribution system that spanned the globe, recordings of Pound remained what is conventionally termed a "hard sell."

Although small in terms of their economic importance, global audiences were clearly symbolically important. The following year, Caedmon released a French language recording of Jean Cocteau reading from his own works. This recording represented the second face of modernism in its francophone modality. However, like the

Joyce and Pound recordings, it had a rhetorical or political function that exceeded this. Recordings of French poets were a significant genre in the field of spoken word recording.[21] These seem to have had a symbolic and ideological value that transcended their limited commercial appeal in that they were seemingly published at least as part of a broader program of "seducing the French" by convincing them of the American interest in French culture. The proliferation of Cocteau's voice appears to have been a sign of the battle for the "hearts and minds" of left-leaning French intellectuals even as Cocteau's early interest in voice transmission and voice reproduction technologies, like that of Joyce and Pound, also warranted his inclusion in the Caedmon catalogue. (Cocteau's connection with Pound may have played a part in the editorial decision to include him in the Caedmon catalogue in that selections from Cocteau's *Plain-chant*, which had so profoundly influenced Pound's experiments as a librettist in collaboration with composer George Antheuil, were prominently featured.)

Interestingly, Cocteau himself designed the record jacket for his Caedmon album. His self-portrait—which was set against a red, white, and blue background—seemed to iconically signal a Franco-American pattern of cultural interchange that was so prominent in the body of modern French and American poetry. Despite this, the negotiations behind the Cocteau recording indicate a high degree of mistrust on Cocteau's part. As with the Pound recording, the production of the Cocteau voice document was mediated by a third party, in the form of Herbert Lottman as Caedmon's Paris-based agent. Lottman was an important figure in Franco-American Cold War cultural politics who subsequently wrote a chronicle of Cold War cultural politics in the French context entitled *The Left Bank: Writers, Artists, and Politics from the Popular Front to the Cold War*.

Lottman effaced himself as an agent acting within that politicized field of cultural production in that account. However, Caedmon's business records indicate that he was a key player in that field of cultural production who effected the mediation of voice documents that were made in France but subsequently published in America. A February 17 1956 letter from Lottman to Holdridge indicated that it was he who had facilitated the recording of Camus and he who had first suggested recording the works of Beckett. The letter also indicated that as of that date Lottman was pursing several other recording projects for Caedmon that ultimately did not bear fruit, including projects to record

François Mauriac, Jules Romain, Pablo Picasso and Marc Chagall. However, Lottman did secure Cocteau's participation, albeit not without difficulty.

According to correspondence from Lottman to Caedmon, an engineer named Ripley made the recording of Cocteau in 1956 in Paris. From the beginning, negotiations between Lottman as Caedmon's agent and the literary agent representing Cocteau—whom Lottman refers to only as "Worms"—seem to have been singularly hostile, however. A letter from Lottman to Holdridge, which was dated November 17 1956, detailed that the project was fraught from the outset by the fact that Cocteau had insisted on re-recording material that he had already recorded for Pathé-Marconi and for which the latter retained foreign distribution rights. This alone would seem to suggest a certain resistance to recording. Cocteau's agent's distrust of Caedmon also seems to have been based in part on the very different philosophy of copyright that governs intellectual copyright in the American and French contexts. So deep was this mistrust that "Worms" was apparently under the illusion that a customary clause in the standard Caedmon contract that allowed Caedmon to publish a line from each recording for the purpose of advertising needed to be modified in order to show that that line would be used only for such purposes because, as Lottman reported, without due vigilance it might otherwise be used for the purposes of selling soap. Nor was Cocteau's agent satisfied with Caedmon's standard royalty formula. Like other agents, he rejected the royalty scheme that arose when Caedmon marketed recordings wholesale at prices greater than 52 and ½%. In light of these difficulties, it is perhaps not very surprising that the Cocteau recording was published posthumously shortly after Cocteau's death some eight years after it was first recorded in Paris.

Caedmon returned to Cocteau in 1966 with the publication of another French language recording. This second recording involved the publication of an interview with Cocteau that had been published in the *Paris Review*. The interview, which had been published in the April 1964 edition of that periodical was framed by journalist William Fifield as Cocteau's "last testament." In it, Cocteau discussed the modernist literary tradition that extended from Stendahl, Proust, and Flaubert to himself along with figures he had known including Chaplin, Gide, Nijinsky, Faulkner, Modigliani and Hemingway. In general, the correspondence behind *Jean Cocteau: A Self Portrait* seems to indicate a certain constellation of Cold War cultural institutions that spanned the divide between commercial and ideological cultural production. The *Paris Review* has been recognized as a key institution at the heart of Franco-American cultural relations during the Cold War that served to mediate French culture to American audiences (Stonor Saunders 246). The agent that first advanced the idea of a commercial record of the Fifield interview also suggested an oblique connection between the periodical and Caedmon noting: "Since this important international review probably touches the same potential clientele as the Caedmon Album of the Fifield-Cocteau interview . . . a tie-in with THE PARIS REVIEW might be advantageous to Caedmon."[22] Despite Holdridge and Mantell's assertion that Caedmon records did not enjoy wide-scale international distribution, letters such this suggest that international distribution was important.

The circumstances surrounding the publication of Fifield's tape-recorded interview in multiple media formats also does much to indicate the social life of postmodern voice documents as well as to re-materialize the networks in which such documents were disseminated. The voice document that was first transcribed and published in the *Paris Review* went on to be published in the United States by the Viking Press as part of its *Famous Writers at Work* series. It was subsequently published in French by the Cold War press Stock Editions. Finally, excerpts of that interview were also published in popular print periodicals within the United States. Caedmon as the document's voice publisher played a role in this chain of dissemination but it was not the end-point of that chain. Fifield himself also played a role in publicizing the recording in different American print periodicals. Writing to Holdridge on August 3 1965, he suggested that Caedmon should arrange for excerpts of the interview to be published in *Vogue* magazine; as a second choice, Fifield advocated *Harper's Bazaar*. His letter indicated that he rejected Holdridge's idea of co-publication in *The Atlantic Monthly* and that at the time Caedmon was contemplating the publication of the Cocteau material in either *McCalls* or *Writer's Digest*. Correspondence such as this indicates the social life of a single three and a half-hour interview as an aural commodity. It indicates the material networks involved in disseminating "the second face of Modernism" in the 1950s and 1960s, including the origins of postmodern paratexts as supplements to written literary texts in the institutions of the cultural Cold War.

The interview genre itself was one of the pre-immanent cultural genres of the Cold War. Certainly, Warhol's periodical publication of the same name indicates the centrality of the genre in postmodern culture. The interview is both an artifact of media shift and the cult of the intellectual and literary celebrity that blurs the boundaries between secondary literacy and secondary orality; it is also effectively a postmodern form of highly edited speech. In turning to the interview genre as a postmodern paratext, Caedmon was clearly mediating the voices of key literary and cultural figures of the twentieth century for an audience that was attuned to a mediasphere of secondary orality rather than a print-mediated public sphere. At the same time, the semiotics of which authors and artists were recorded—which sign was proliferated or which voices were amplified—often invoked a certain constellation of signs that were part of the cultural politics of the Cold War.

The Caedmon catalogue remained committed to capturing the voices of the first generation of stylistically innovative American poets and authors—even as the rhetorical energies of America's Cold War reading crusade were clearly dissipating. One of these LPs, *Ernest Hemingway Reading*, was published in 1965. Caedmon had never come to terms with Hemingway during his lifetime but several years after his death his widow arranged for Caedmon to posthumously publish several recordings of her husband. *Side One* of the album began with the author's reading of his Nobel Prize acceptance speech, which had been recorded at a Cuban radio station. The rest of the LP consisted of paratextual ephemera that had been privately recorded. Several selections included had literary merit, however. At the other end of the public/private continuum was Hemingway's relatively subdued performance of what was entitled "A Work in Progress" as a kind of taped "manuscript" that had been mailed to his editor A.E. Hotchner for feedback. However, by far the most interesting selection to have been included was Hemingway's performance of "Second Poem to Mary," which was written in Paris during September and October of 1944 as the Allies were in the process of retaking that city.

Hemingway published a number of sexually explicit poems throughout the twenties and continued to privately write ribald poetry throughout his life. The poetry that he wrote during the Second World War and shortly thereafter was of a very order, however. Hemingway's wartime poetry deserves serious critical consideration for his representation of the impact on social relations of innovations in wartime media and for his perception of the performative impact of new media technologies that simulated bodily presence. A prominent feature in "Second Poem to Mary," for example, is the recurring motif of polymeric copies that simulate the presence of intimates and which are at the same time oddly spiritualized; a secondary motif is that of endless repetition. Another prominent formal feature of the poem is the impact of radio communication on the regular code of linguistic communication, or the militarization of language. Woven into the fabric of the poem was a series of reports of those missing in action that imitated two-way radio communication, for example.[23] Like most of Hemingway's poetry, this work had never been published during his lifetime. The publication of that poem as a voice document contributes significantly to an understanding of Hemingway's development as a writer. Although he seems drunk on this recording, it seems likely that Hemingway may have recorded the poem as a preliminary to his planned Caedmon recording session given that he told his wife that he planned to read poetry.

Far from being simple *read text* recordings, most of the other selections included on *Ernest Hemingway Reading* contested the performance genres of secondary orality in very interesting ways. These recordings reveal that far from endorsing the political exigencies of America's Cold War reading crusade and the injunction that writers must perform their works aloud in public, Hemingway parodied it. One might tentatively suggest that Hemingway's privately recorded performances revealed him to be one of the literary modernists who was the most resistant to the shift from print to voice media and the incitement that writers themselves must perform in these new forms of media. *Side Two* closed with the author's irreverent performance of what was entitled "Saturday Night at the Whorehouse in Billings, Montana" as an elaboration on the sexual motifs of Hemingway's story "The Light of the World" and in particular Hemingway's fondness for a 210-pound prostitute named Alice. The last track of *Side One* involved Hemingway's drunken self-parody *Across the River and Into the Trees*, which Hemingway apparently recorded to top another parody of the same work that had recently been published in the *New Yorker*. Clearly, most of the privately recorded voice documents on Hemingway's album were not intended for publication. However, one of them was made as part of a preliminary consideration of the possibilities of a television series to be devoted to Hemingway's short stories. In that recording, Hemingway provided an account of the historical events that formed the background to his little-known political play "The Fifth Column." Despite the economic remuneration that he was offered, Hemingway ultimately rejected the television medium apparently because of his dissatisfaction with the sound of his own voice. (Both of Caedmon's founders say that the real reason they never came to terms with Hemingway involved his high-pitched vocal apparatus rather than for economic reasons.) If published, his high-pitched voice would have served to undermine his carefully constructed hyper-masculine image—as a supplement to his decidedly queer written works—as transmitted most notably in photo-magazines such as *LIFE*.

The posthumous harvesting of these kinds of ephemeral recordings as commercial voice documents indicates that recordings of canonic literary modernists were becoming rare. Unlike other record companies, Caedmon did not move into the area of recordings of contemporary poetry and prose but instead began to mine the historical sound recording archive—increasingly in the form of paratextual ephemera rather than *read text* recordings *per se*. In 1965, for example, it released a series of six Charles Eliot Norton lectures that e. e. cummings had given at Harvard in 1952 and 1953. This mining of the voice recording archive gradually replaced "first edition" *read text* recordings. Most frequently, Caedmon supplemented its own recordings with copies of sound recordings that had been made by heterogeneous institutional and commercial recorders and lodged in the Library of Congress for the purposes of establishing copyright. Sometimes, it harvested recordings made by the Library of Congress as in the case of its 1962 publication of a recording of the Spanish/Puerto Rican poet Juan Ramon Jiménez who had been recorded in 1957.[24] Occasionally, Caedmon drew on voice documents that had been lodged at the nearby Brander Matthews Dramatic Voice Museum. The BBC was also an important source of historical recordings, particularly in relation to the Dylan Thomas archive. Sometimes, Caedmon re-released materials that had been previously published; in 1961, for example, it published a recording of Edna St. Vincent Millay that had previously been published by RCA-Victor in 78-rpm format as transcribed from the poet's wartime radio broadcasts.

This turn seems to have begun in 1955 and 1956 with the release of the Lindsay and Stein archival recordings and the production of the Caedmon *Treasury*. The label also published a production of *Under Milk Wood* Thomas's "play for voices" in 1955. The production had been recorded by the Poetry Center in May of 1953 as part of the process of workshopping the play.[25] Almost all of these archival recordings involved literary recordings. However, the very first archival recording to be released was of evangelist Peter Marshall, who had served as Chaplain of Congress during the war. Neither of Caedmon's founders has elaborated on their decision to release these recorded sermons under the title *Peter Marshall Speaks*. Clearly, Caedmon was paying "lip service" to the religious mandate that underwrote America's Cold War reading crusade, however.[26] With the inclusion of these kinds of voice documents, the catalogue began to be shaped by the mandates of heterogeneous institutional recorders and by different forms of radiophonic sonic discursivity in particular.

Even as the catalogue reflected the turn to archival recordings, it also began to mimic "positions" that had been taken in the larger voice recording archive during the era of partial sound spectrum recording. The voice-images of many of the lesser-known modernists that Caedmon recorded, such as Aiken and de la Mare, had circulated in various mediated versions during the 1930s. Caedmon also undertook to make *spoken text* recordings of works that had been read by poets and authors who had been recorded during the era of partial sound spectrum recording—most notably in the case of Shaw and Joyce. The presence of the nearby Brander Matthews Voice Museum seems to have occasionally inspired Caedmon "versions" of *read* and *spoken text* documents. The production of these reflected the propensity of record labels to imitate one another's positions within the field of spoken word recording much as human beings do in conditions of primary orality. To some extent, they can also be seen as a kind of postmodern recycling of the voice documents of the historical sound recording archive.

This principle of mimicry also applied when Caedmon undertook to make *spoken text* recordings of authors who had already been recorded by other labels, as in the case of short story stylist Dorothy Parker. Holdridge and Mantell had rejected the prospect of recording Parker. As Mantell notes: "We thought there was something ephemeral there." Caedmon warmed up to the idea very late in Parker's life when Parker's health was declining, perhaps its competitor Spoken Arts had already recorded the author. As Mantell recalls: "I visited her at the Volney Hotel when she was very ill. She said that she wished that she had recorded for us but it was too late." Instead, actress Shirley Booth was selected to perform Parker's stories. The star of the television series *Hazel* had first approached Caedmon with a project to record her own poetry in conjunction with her reading of the work of an established author. "We uncoupled that pretty fast," as Mantell recalls. In this case, Caedmon's "position-taking" was significant because Booth's voice metonymically represented another media culture, that of television. Perhaps coincidentally Booth was also prominently featured in printed propaganda materials produced by the USIA that were directed towards audiences in CP countries (Hixson 136). In this case, then, Caedmon's "position-taking" with reference to recordings of Parker is particularly postmodern in that it gestures to the mass culture industry and other media cultures—including that of the USIA.

Very few *read text* recordings by poets and authors were released after the production of the *Treasury. Read text* recordings that were published in 1958 included *Robert Graves Reads from His Poetry and the White Goddess* and the Spender record that Bartók recorded in November 1956; Katherine Anne Porter also made a recording of her novella *Noon Wine* for the label that year. No *read text* recordings were released in 1959. A French-language of Albert Camus was released in 1960, however. Like many of the foreign writers whom Caedmon recorded, Camus' politics were significant in terms of the cultural Cold War in that unlike Jean-Paul Sartre and other prominent French intellectuals he openly rejected the authority of the French Communist Party. Once again, the politics of cultural mediation were clearly at work. Camus was also one of the many poets and authors who were recorded very soon before their deaths. As Holdridge jokes darkly: "We got the reputation of being the people you didn't want to have around if you wanted to have a long life. We recorded people just before they died. We recorded Colette six weeks before she died. We recorded Camus just before he smashed into that tree—and of course, Dylan Thomas. We started to get a reputation."

Caedmon published a *read text* recording of England's Poet Laureate John Masefield in 1964. The label also published a Russian language recording of Yevgeny Yevtushenko in 1966. The poet was recorded reading *Babbi Yar*, his long poem about the Nazi massacre of 34,000 Jews near Kiev during the Second World War. (Alan Bates performed selections of the poet's works in English on the second side.) The label also released a Spanish language recording of Pablo Neruda in 1967. The Chilean communist had been persuaded to record for Caedmon by MacLeish while both were attending a PEN conference. (This relatively late recording testifies to the ongoing participation of MacLeish in the Caedmon project.) In 1968, Caedmon also published two *read text* LPs of Richard Eberhart and Richard Wilbur as poets who had been prominently featured on the *Treasury.* The label began to experiment with new *read text* genres that year. It also produced a recording of Brother Antonius as the most apolitical of the so-called San Francisco poets; it also published a more commercial recording entitled *J.R.R. Tolkien*: *Poems and Songs of Middle Earth* that featured the pseudonymous author of *Lord of the Rings* reading "The Adventures of Tom Bombadil" and performing a song cycle that had been composed from his poetry. The moment of postwar mass culture was clearly over. The consolidation of the counter-culture—on LP and elsewhere—was well underway.

Throughout this period of proliferating *read* and *spoken text* genres, recordings of Dylan Thomas had remained the touchstone of Caedmon enterprise. After *Under Milk Wood,* Caedmon released *Dylan Thomas Volume 3* in 1956. The posthumously published LP was the first to reveal two of the many different sides of Thomas. *Side One* was made from a tape recording of Thomas reading at MIT in March of 1952. Only Thomas' *read text* readings of "On the Marriage of a Virgin," "The Hunchback in the Park and Over Sir John's Hill" were included. In contrast, *Side Two* drew from a privately recorded reading that had been made in an indeterminate context. It included Thomas' performance of "Two Light Breaks Where No Sun Shines," "After the Funeral" and "In Country Sleep." The liner notes reported that Thomas had been recorded reading during what was referred to as "his second visit to America, in the Fall of 1951 [which] coincided with the publication of *In Country Sleep.*" However, Thomas did not visit the U.S. in 1951 and New Directions published *In Country Sleep* in 1952. As the origins of the privately recorded voice document are not identified, the primary performance context cannot be ascertained. However, on this occasion Thomas spoke in a slurring thick voice and had difficulty pronouncing the kinetically complex patterns of consonance in his own poems. Thomas was at best drunk when it was recorded.[27]

Caedmon returned to Thomas in 1958 with the release of *Dylan Thomas Reading A Visit to America and Poems*. The album was drawn from a recorded live reading at the University of British Columbia and a radio broadcast for the CBC, both of which were undertaken in Vancouver in May of 1952. It also involved a live performance at MIT in April of 1953 that been recorded by the Cambridge educational radio station WGBH. *Volume IV* focused largely on Thomas's *spoken text* performances. It included Thomas' performance of Hardy's "Broken Appointment," "To Lisbie Brown" and "In Death Divided." It also included Auden's *Master N Bos'N Song* and *As I Walked out One Evening* and Walter de la Mare's *The Bards.* The album reflected Thomas's commitment to lesser-known poets in his performances of poems by Edward Thomas and Henry Reid. His performance of Reid's poem "Chard Whitlow: Mr. T.S. Eliot's Sunday Evening Broadcast Postscript" was particularly notable because Thomas imitated T.S. Eliot's distinctive delivery in performing Reid's poem, which itself is a parody of Eliot's verse. In addition to the *spoken text* performances outlined above, the album also contained Thomas' live performance of his radio talk "A Visit to America."

Caedmon returned to the Thomas archive in 1960 with the release of *Dylan Thomas Reading Quite Early One Morning*. The album consisted of material drawn from the poet's performances over the BBC, including a 1945 broadcast of the short story from which the album took its name. Caedmon returned to the Thomas archive once again in 1963 with the release of *An Evening with Dylan Thomas,* which like previous LPs drew on material from different sources. These included a radio talk that was entitled "On Reading Poetry Aloud" and Thomas' performance of two of his own works "If My Head Hurt a Hair's Foot" and "Poem in October," which had been broadcast on the BBC in 1949. However, the album drew mainly on material from Thomas's *spoken text* performance at Berkeley University in April 1950. Included were Thomas' performance of an anonymous Welsh poem, two poems by Thomas Hardy, and a poem each of W.H. Davies, W.R. Rogers, Alun Lewis and John Betjeman. Three works by W.B. Yeats, two by W.H. Auden, and one by Andrew Young were also included, as was Thomas' *read text* performance of two of his own poems "This Side of Truth" and "In My Craft or

Sullen Art." The album also began with a warm-up routine that was entitled "An Irreverent Introduction" as an abbreviated version of "A Few Words of a Kind."

Caedmon dipped into the Thomas archive the following year with the publication of *Dylan Thomas Reading His Complete Recorded Poetry*. The two-disc album drew from Thomas' performances on the BBC and on American educational radio stations, his live performances at American universities, Caedmon's Thomas LPs and other heterogeneous voice recordings. This LP revealed the many sides of Dylan Thomas: indeed, the voice that emerges from that collection is of a seemingly fragmented and multiple personality who performed his works very differently in different performance contexts. Thomas' live American performances and his British radio performances are very different from one another in particular, but even these are radically multiple. This is not very surprising given that Thomas' biographers have stressed his "chameleon-like" character and his propensity to perform different personae not only in public but also everyday life (Fryer 150). Thomas' voice image gained some of its multiplicity through the institutional sound-signatures of particular recorders and the trace of particular sound recording technologies, which seem to speak as much as the poet himself.

These late Thomas albums are essentially historical documents that offer a complex record of Thomas' popularity during his lifetime as well as providing insight into the factors that contributed to his posthumous legend. They are of particular interest for the ways that Thomas performed the material conditions that grounded his performances in America, often in the form of the icebreakers that he used to introduce his performances in different contexts, which were more akin to stand-up comedy than any other spoken word genre. These were essentially parodies of the poetry and lecture reading circuit as a manifestation of the reading and cultural "crusade" within America. "A Few Words of Kind" was the first of these icebreakers to be included on a Caedmon album. During that talk, in a punning allusion to Holdridge and Mantell—for whom he had recorded a few weeks before—Thomas explained the need for comedic interludes between the reading of poems, noting: "A whole hour of loud and unrelieved verse-speaking is, I imagine, hell to anyone except ardent young hunters of culture with net, notebook, poison bottle, pin and label."

After Thomas had satirized the agents involved in producing—and reproducing—the mid-century poetry reading circuit, he proceeded to satirize his own lack of qualifications as educational lecturer:

> I could, for instance, talk about my education, which critics say I have not got! And that's true enough. But I do wish I had learned some other languages apart from English, BBC Third Programme, and saloon. Then perhaps I could understand what some people mean who say that I have been influenced by Rimbaud.

Finally, Thomas turned his wit against his live audience, satirizing their intellectual one-upmanship through the obvious display of paperback reading material as a manifestation of the symbolic power associated with Cold War reading programs. Typically, he did so in the form of an indirect sexual allusion. ("I've got Kierkegaard in my pocket. What's in yours?") In an allusion to both the threat of nuclear warfare—and possibly the fact that *Horizon* as Britain's pre-eminent cultural periodical had been founded by the heir to a margarine fortune—Thomas also satirized his audience's propensity to ask overly earnest questions at the end of his readings (such as "What is the relationship of the poet to society in the Hydrogenated Age?")

"A Visit to America," which Thomas had also performed in front of a live audience at MIT in 1953, was much more openly a satire of the live lecture and poetry reading circuit as a material manifestation of America's Cold War reading and cultural crusade. Thomas' talent for mimicry was well in evidence throughout the talk as he recounted the experience of visiting European lecturers, of being met by what he described as one nest of "culture vultures" after another as they traveled across the American hinterland and typically by "the richest, largest, furriest lady available" in any given locale. Much of the hilarity of "A Visit to America" involved Thomas's imitation of the voices of his American hosts, including that of the "large horn-rimmed businessman looking just like the large horn-rimmed businessman in films" who was his inevitable chauffeur and the businessman's "roly-poly, pearly wife" who became the lecturer's backseat companion. However, as usual Thomas saved his most savage treatment for himself. As he noted in a series of bathetic appositives: "In the sticky thick of lecturers moving across the Continent go the foreign poets, guitar-al [gutteral] troubadours, lyrical one night standers, dollar-mad nightingales, remittance bards from home—myself among them, booming with the worst."

The third of these icebreakers, "An Irreverent Introduction," was included in *An Evening with Dylan Thomas.* It was drawn from Thomas' performance in front of a live audience at Berkeley in April 1950. Thomas' performance on that occasion was notable in particular for the way it revealed his capacity for mimicry and linguistic code-switching. Thomas began that talk with the Cockney interjection, "Gor Blimey!" The *spoken text* performances that followed were rendered in Welsh-accented and Irish-accented English. They included the anonymous Welsh poem "A Traveller's Curse After Misdirection," James Stephens' "A Glass of Beer," and W.H. Davies' "One Poet Visits Another." Thomas also rendered Auden's "Master and Bos'n Song" in an imitation Cockney dialect. These performances were paired with archival BBC recordings where Thomas spoke in a soft, crooning Welsh-accented English that was entirely unlike the almost belligerently British voice that he often performed in front of his American audiences, and the more passively but equally correct spoken Received Pronunciation British English that characterized the vast majority of his performances over the BBC. *An Evening with Dylan Thomas* reveals a linguistically split speaking subject in that Thomas simultaneously performed and subverted what might be termed "voice regimes" and most notably RP English.

In general, Thomas performed different forms of socially situated speech in ways that complicate authorial essence. As a linguistically split speaking subject, Thomas did not articulate an ideologically-centered voice culture so much as he synthesized what might be termed a post-colonial voice culture, largely through tactics of mimicry and code-switching. Thomas' voice practice effectively allowed him to articulate multiple speaking subjects simultaneously. Thomas' performance of the written word in conditions of both primary and secondary orality, then, was very different from the rest of the *read texts* that constituted the core of the early Caedmon catalogue in that the complex and multiple articulation of public speech—and not text *per se*—appears to have been the content of his performance.

It is important to acknowledge that Thomas' text practice also represented a "revolution in poetic language." In general, Thomas' poetry exhibited a characteristic split between works that were heavily influenced by traditional Christian tropes and images and a Celtic approach to nature. Between these two conflicting world-views were poems that emphasized themes of childhood, sexual initiation and death. In formal terms, John Ackerman notes that Thomas' early works were characterized by "a violent yoking of discordant images" and "patterns of the duality of experience which were without any narrative design" (7). Ackerman notes that as a result of this refusal of narrative, the "development of 'meaning' . . . is concentric rather than linear" in Thomas' poetry" (7). In other words, meaning inhered in the complex and highly technical use of sound-forms on the phonemic and supra-segmental level rather than in the lexico-semantic and syntactic elements of his poetry, whether that meaning was kinetic, or rhythmic, or whether it depended on what I term homophonic associative chaining as a type of lexical cohesion based on linguistic *differance.* Thomas text-practice was essentially pre-modern and postmodern—and postcolonial—in this respect, even as his work drew very clearly on historical British verse and that of the seventeenth-century metaphysical poets in particular (Kershner 167-171). As Ackerman notes, the themes and formal characteristics of Thomas' work throughout the 1930s were not shared by English poets of the same era although they were well in evidence in the work of other Anglo-Welsh writers (2).

The poetry of Thomas represented a "revolution in poetic language" that occurred shortly before the outbreak of the war. That revolution represented a postmodern recycling of pre-modern poetic forms and a return of the "Celtic repressed," which had also characterized modern French poetry and poetic prose and that of the *symbolistes* in particular, which was reflected in a different way in that of his early mentor Edith Sitwell. In the case of Thomas, this return included patterns of prosody that were part of the bardic tradition of medieval Welsh poetry; in particular, Thomas' poetry drew loosely on the medieval tradition of Welsh prosody, or *cygnhanedd*, which had first been revived in English verse by Gerard Manley Hopkins (Kershner 183-5). Thomas' Christian-themed poems also drew on patterns of Welsh oratory that had been preserved in the Christian Welsh spoken word religious tradition of *hywl* (Ackerman 117). In the case of Sitwell, that return involved a rejection of the dissonant rhythmic "pastiche" of her earlier works in favor of a more musical and even Eliotic synthesis between metered iambic blank verse, the strong stress meter of medieval ballad, the accentual meter of French historical verse, and the complex patterns of vocalic assonance and of the low back vowels in particular that had been so prominent in *symboliste* sound practices.[28] The works of both poets drew heavily on pagan images and on French Celtic and Welsh Celtic sound-forms—even as that of both was also deeply informed by traditional Christian iconography.

Thomas' "Fern Hill" and Sitwell's "Still Falls the Rain" were perhaps the clearest expression of this revolution in poetic language, which began to occur in the late 1930s and intensified throughout the war. Variously described as neo romantic, surrealist, and symbolist, their poetry was entirely outside the discourses of the modern and modernism and the poetics and the rhetoric of classicism/anti-classicism still practiced by the late modernists and most notably by Auden. While their poetry was clearly outside the model of poetic monuments as outlined by T.S. Eliot in "Tradition and the Individual Talent," it spoke deeply to the British psyche during wartime. Both poets were also associated with the lush wartime aesthetic of "culture as compensation." As outlined by Fussell, the lush lyricism and rich oratory of Thomas, the convoluted verbal excess of Osbert Sitwell, and the decadent imagery of Edith Sitwell all emerged as a psychological and linguistic "compensation" to the deprivations of life in wartime (209, 228). The works of all three were also prominently associated with the wartime journal *Horizon,* which emerged as a lush supplement to the defunct *Criterion* in 1940.[29] In particular, Thomas' wartime poetic monument, the pastoral poem "Fern Hill," was first published in that journal.

On many different levels, then, Thomas and Sitwell represented a supplement to modernism and the history of modern poetry—as this consolidated in the British context during wartime. While Sitwell was clearly associated with spoken word performance and with the revival of the live poetry reading in wartime as a supplement to the first face of modernist paraliterary performance culture, with which she was equally involved, Thomas was initially primarily a print poet who achieved his first major success with the publication of the postwar collection *Deaths and Entrances* in 1946. Thomas emerged as a reader of verse for the most part only in the postwar period—and significantly over the airwaves. Although Thomas first performed his poetry for the BBC in 1937 on a program entitled "Life and the Modern Poet" and performed his works and gave radio talks sporadically on the network from that point forward, he did not do so on a regular basis in the 1930s or during wartime as the BBC considered him to be unreliable (Ferris 151, 207). The BBC's Eastern Service was the first to employ Thomas regularly as a reader for international broadcasts. Beginning in 1946, Thomas began to appear on its weekly *Book of Verse* program (Tremlett 104-5). He also appeared on *The Third Programme* after that highbrow alternative was launched also in 1946 (Ferris 266, Tremlett 107). Thomas' success as a reader of his verse and that of others established him as a postwar "media personality" that supplemented his reputation as a print poet.

While Thomas represented the social aging of BBC programming in America, he was primarily a performance poet in the latter context. Ultimately, Thomas' text-practice is largely irrelevant in that context, where few actually read his works. It is his voice practice that is ultimately more important—particularly in terms of his ability to perform multiple voice regimes and media cultures while simultaneously parodying them and subverting them. In general, Thomas' voice practice appears to have represented something purely vocal and performative to Americans. Thomas effectively produced a new form of "public speech" that supplemented print as a public medium; that form of public speech also supplemented dramatic or theatrical declamation as a "national P.A. system" that developed in conditions of primary or non-mediated orality and ideologically-centred Received Pronunciation English as the dialect favored by BBC performers and British lecturers or educators as different forms of British "public speech." Simultaneously, Thomas' voice practice seems to have supplemented the commercial disposition of American radio, television and film voice. While the semiotics of Thomas Welsh voice clearly spoke to Americans who were still haunted by colonial anxieties about American voice, at the same time Thomas' choral voice practice seemingly articulated a counter-culture voice practice that contested the rhetorical energies, and political morality, of public reading as a spoken word performance genre—in part through tactics of vocal (self) parody. After his death, the doubleness of his voice practice would be widely troped as America's "vocal soul."

The politics of Thomas' voice practice were also very different in the British and the American contexts even as he performed his works in RP English in both of those contexts. Thomas boasted on many occasions that he did not consider himself to have a

Welsh accent. However, there is considerable variation in how Thomas performed BBC RP English as what might be termed a "voice regime." *An Evening with Dylan Thomas* reveals that he sometimes gave radio talks and performed his own works in a Welsh-inflected voice. The kinetic rhythms of Thomas' voice practice effectively functioned to "dialogize" the RP BBC English as an ideologically centered form of public speech. This surfaced most often when Thomas performed his Christian-themed poetry, which he inflected with a certain linguistic excess in the forms of traditions of Welsh religious oratory or *hywl*, or when he used the highly stylized "breathless poetic voice" that at least some of his supervisors at the BBC found so objectionable, including G.R Barnes who was the BBC's London Director of Talks (Ferris 161). Thomas performed with a forked tongue, in effect performing himself as a linguistically split or colonized speaking subject. Thomas' repressed Welsh vocal identity is at the heart of his vocal multiplicity in the British context even as he generally performed his works and those of others primarily as a linguistically dominated British subject.

Thomas' live performances in America were fundamentally different in tone and much more heterogeneous in linguistic terms. Thomas also performed RP English on the live lecture and poetry reading circuit in America although he used a more embodied and declamatory or projective style rather than the intimate spoken BBC English he used over the airwaves. *An Evening With Dylan Thomas* reveals that he sometimes supplemented ideologically centered RP British English with Welsh, Irish and Cockney voice. Through tactics of mimicry, particularly in his icebreakers, Thomas added vocal images of various media cultures, including his parody of Eliot's iconic "radio voice," or the flat mid-Western (film) voice that he parodied in "A Visit to America," or his parody of the voices of his live audiences. As a performer of the spoken word, Thomas essentially juxtaposed different spoken word performance genres and different spoken word media cultures with images of the primary spoken word vernacular. In live performance, he constantly dramatized the shifting disposition of his voice, as shaped by all.

Thomas' Caedmon albums were very different from his live performances; interestingly, they were also very different from one another. Many of the works that Thomas performed on *Volume 2* were characterized by an alternation between two very different voice regimes—the plummy tones of intimate and spoken RP English, or BBC

Third Programme as a regime of secondary orality, and a projected or declaimed English that mimicked British stage voice as a "national P.A. system" that was shaped under conditions of primary or non-technologized orality. Not all of the poems on *Volume 2* exhibited this characteristic oscillation; Thomas' performance of "Poem on His Birthday" and "A Winter's Tale" were characterized by an oscillation between intimate BBC English and the medieval chanting favored by many poets of Celtic origin; Thomas' performance of "A Refusal to Mourn the Death of a Child, by Fire, In London" and "There was a Saviour" were modified by techniques of Welsh religious oratory. Nonetheless, in aggregate Thomas oscillated between codes of dramatic speech and codes of intimate spoken BBC English. This is particularly well in evidence in his performance of "Lament" and "Should Lanterns Shine." In this album, Thomas also performed his works primarily as a linguistically dominated speaking subject. He remained largely in "British voice," mimicking declaimed British theatrical speech in particular as a form of linguistic capital and as a form of symbolic power.

Thomas' more intimate performance in his first Caedmon album was very different from this. Even as Thomas also performed as a linguistically split speaking subject, he oscillated between intimate BBC spoken English that typified radio as a medium of secondary orality and a highly embodied Celtic chanting which was a residue of medieval Welsh primary orality. In this way, his performance was particularly pre-modern/postmodern and postcolonial. This chanting was most in evidence in Thomas' performance of "Fern Hill" and "In the White Giant's Thigh." In addition to performing the complex patterns of rhyme, assonance and consonance that structure these poems as a loose form of *cynghanned*, Thomas used the supplemental technique of phonemic stretching to lengthen various vocables. He did so throughout "Fern Hill," in particular, chanting words such as "the-en," "su-un," "ra-an" and "you-ung." Effectively, Thomas turned these short vowels into dipthongs—lengthening these and emphasizing the singing nasal resonants that followed them. In effect, Thomas supplemented his text practice by adding patterns of sound that were not scored in the poem as graphotext. Thomas' performance of these two poems was fundamentally pre-/postmodern and postcolonial in that he emphasized his Anglo-Welsh vocal identity into his performance of his verse.

Even more interesting is way that Thomas performed his poetic monument "Fern Hill" through the relatively rarer technique of using contrasting allophones to vary the meaning of words in a way that allowed for a counter-culture voice practice. This technique added an element of ribald and even pornographic wordplay and introduced an element of dissonance into his performance. This technique surfaced most notably in his performance of "Fern Hill" and the equally pastoral but more openly sexually evocative "In the White Giant's Thigh." Thomas practiced this phonemic wordplay the most consistently with his substitution of a word that sounds like "fux"—or more accurately "fuxes" [f∧ks∂s]—for the word "foxes" [fρks∂s] which occurs frequently in many of Thomas' pastoral poems. Thomas read the word "foxes" as "fuxes," for example, as it appears in the lines "And green and golden I was huntsman and herdsman, the calves/Sang to my horn, the foxes on the hills barked clear and cold." Later in the poem, he read the line "And honoured among foxes and pheasants by the gay house" more clearly as "foxes." A similar pattern occurred in Thomas' reading of "In the White Giant's Thigh," where he clearly read the word "foxes" as "fuxes" in the lines "Their breast, the vaulting does roister, the horned bucks climb/Quick in the wood at love, where a torch of foxes foams." Later in the poem, he read the line "Saved by the their long desirers in the fox cubbed" more clearly as "fox cubbed." He then closed with the line "And the daughters of darkness flame like Fawkes fires still" in way that contrastively lengthened and emphasized the homophonic low back vowel in "Fawkes."

In essence, Thomas performed an upward shifting "guitar-al" or guttural slide that ranged from the low back vowel sound "aw" [ρ] to the high mid-vowel sound "uh" [∧]. This play clearly invoked the sound-practices of the *symbolistes* even as it also invoked a "schoolboy" sensibility. Thomas' use of this stylization technique was achieved through his technique of heightening the back vowel that occurs in the middle of "fox" and more frequently through his technique of dipthongizing short vowels by inserting the "uh" sound before or after the vowel itself. In this way—in a play of spoken word *differance*—he simultaneously says both "fucks" and "fox." Thomas' use of the technique depended on its seeming randomness. Sometimes, he used the allophone innocently in a way that suggested that it might merely be a Welsh variant of the mid back vowel [aw], as when he read the line “Into the weathercock’s molten mouths” from “Ceremony After a Fire Raid” as “Into the weathercucks molten mouths.” More dissonantly, Thomas dipthongized the word “forked” as “fuh-orked” in the lines “Because their words had forked no lightning they/Do not go gentle into that good night” from the poem of the same name. This pronunciation is in fact partially Welsh, where the word “buoy,” for example, is pronounced “bu-oy.”

However, Thomas also seems to have been publicly pornographicizing the poem in a way that suggests a certain poetic license even as it evokes the subliminated eroticism of the pastoral genre in general and the sexual subtext that is present in many of Thomas’ works even on the level of the graphotext. (These were audible to many of the *Atlantic’s* readers subvocalizing as they read and resulted in the hundreds of cancellations recalled by Holdridge.) That sexual content often surfaces as the result of systems of homophonic cohesion at work in the phonotext as in the two lines quoted from “In the White Giant’s Thigh,” which includes the suggestive words “breast,” “horned,” “love,” and “foxes/fuxes.” This technique of linguistic breaching or spoken word *differance* allowed a profane and private voice to emerge from the folds of Thomas public one: in sum, it introduced an anarchist element into the poetry reading as a public spoken word performance genre. It is this linguistic breaching that is both proliferated and contained by the mediation of Thomas’ voice as the second pole of spoken word containment culture during “the LP moment.” It is also this breaching that is a supplement to the poetry reading as an exercise in the performance or publication of the literary word—but also a form of public morality. This linguistic breaching was at the scene of a postmodern orality that supplemented *read text* secondary literacy and subverted the rhetorical energies of reading as “crusade.” In sum, it was the scene not only of a public voice culture as a postmodern supplement to written texts but also of a postmodern parody that sowed the seeds of a spoken word counter-culture.

It is a testament to the choral multiplicity of Thomas as a linguistically split speaking subject that he was able to speak to many different audiences simultaneously in both his live and secondary or technologized spoken word performances—appealing to anarchists and Christians, the middlebrow and the common man. Thomas’ voice practice was at the heart of the attempts to develop a secondary or mass mediated voice culture as a form of American public speech that supplemented text as the content of postmodern media systems. Oddly, the task of articulating a universal and yet polysemous voice culture that supplemented the twin legacies of print and theatrical performance as engines of the European modern did not fall to America's poets or its actors but rather to a Welsh vocal surrogate whose posthumous legend was consistently rendered in a rhetoric of sacrifice and crucifixion. Even as America consolidated around Cold War containment culture and the military semiotics and public morality of its Cold War Crusade, it also memorialized dissent and the voice of a poet who practiced a free speech in the darkest hours of McCarthyism—as this constrained all forms of public speech in America—particularly in the early 1950s as the period when Thomas' American legend was made.

Thomas' irreverent voice practice offered a kind of dialectical commodity image of both the public and political morality of reading aloud but also an incipient counter-culture. This doubleness drove the production, consumption and exchange of his voice as a symbolic commodity in "the LP moment" even as the Thomas legend would later be romanticized. By 1960, the project of articulating the secondary or mass-mediated voice culture that supplemented print as a public medium had turned to postmodern Shakespeare and the tradition of dramatic verse as the content of "the stereo moment." The cultural work of poets in articulating a secondary or mass-technologized voice culture during the monaural era, and of modern poetry as the content of postmodern mass media and of postmodern mass media systems, had been all but forgotten—which is perhaps why we no longer hear the parody and dissent in Thomas' choral, multiple and fundamentally anarchist voice practice as the "voice inside the machine"—and a postmodern supplement to "the second face of Modernism."

NOTES

[1] While the record was announced late in 1956, it was listed in the Schwann LP Catalogue only in 1961. This four-year gap may testify to the ideological or educational function of the voice document as one that may not have been available commercially, although such a reading must remain speculative.

[2] Shuster is an interesting figure to contemplate because he was central in the development of programs of humanistic education that were deployed internationally in the service of achieving American foreign policy objectives, primarily through the foundation-funded American Assembly, which was launched at Columbia University in 1950 by the pre-Presidential Dwight Eisenhower. As such, Shuster was an important figure in the revival of humanistic education within America during the postwar period and in the development of international programs of humanistic education that designed to achieve America's foreign policy objectives internationally. See in particular Shuster's contribution to *Cultural Affairs and Foreign Relations* (1963). In general, mass education was shadowed by the influence of New York's educational

institutions including CUNY and Columbia and the wider ongoing scene of mass education as mandated by UNESCO, in which many of New York's professorate was also actively involved.

[3] That March 1957 letter also indicates that Caedmon was dismayed that the Arts Council had apparently already awarded its worldwide rights to its incipient "Shakespeare project" to Argo and that were Caedmon to pursue American rights to that recording project, as it apparently had some interest in doing, it would have to negotiate for these with its competitor Argo.

[4] Among other objectives, USIS had the mandate to "tell the truth," to "explain United States motives," to "give a true and convincing picture of America life, methods, and ideals," to "combat misrepresentation and distortion," and to "aggressively interpret and support our foreign policy" (Henderson 65).

[5] The Nixon era government publication *U.S. Information Agency Operations* (1971) revealed: "The Agency supports a variety of commercial publishing programs designed to promote the widest possible dissemination abroad of books which illustrate important aspects of American life and culture." As the report noted: "In the last 20 years, the Agency has assisted in the publication of more than 19,000 editions and some 157 million copies, including serializations" in some 57 languages. In the previous year alone, the USIA has sponsored the publication of 3.3 million copies of 678 editions of American works in both English and foreign languages" (203).

[6] The discourse of weaponization is prevalent in the many histories of the USIA that have been published. For an account of the role of various USIA apparatus and its electronic apparatus in particular in bringing about the fall of communism, see the memoir of the USIA's Reagan-era director Alvin Snyder, *Warriors of Disinformation: American Propaganda, Soviet Lies, and the Winning of the Cold War*.

[7] References to the 1952 recording of Mistral abound in Caedmon's first appeals to writers but the fact that the Mistral recording is not listed in the *Schwann Record Playing Catalogue* suggests that it was not published commercially or that it may have been produced under the auspices of a government or foundation-funded agency that produced cultural materials not intended for American audiences and which were in fact prohibited from distribution within the continental United States.

[8] For an unspecified period of time after the war, Harold Mantell made documentary films for the USIA and its precursors. This included documentaries about regions of America as seen by America's writers such as Steinbeck, Faulkner and Cummings, along with more prosaic subjects such as America's public health programs. Mantell worked in military radio during wartime. He met Eleanor Roosevelt during her Pacific tour; she helped him to establish a career with the agency and its precursors. Later, Mantell worked as a speechwriter for Adlai Stevenson. Through her husband, Mantell was connected to both the USIA and highest echelons of the Democratic Party (Disposition of Marianne Mantell, p.115-124.)

[9] Disposition of Marianne Mantell, p. 716.

[10] These interviews were subsequently published under the title *Contemporary American Poetry* under the USIA imprint. Despite prohibitions to the contrary, the anthology was published by Basic Books in America, as were other Voice of America Forum Lectures.

[11] Sandburg had died in 1967 at the age of eighty-nine but he had been recorded at meetings of the Classical Guitar Society in New York in 1952 and 1953 by an acolyte named Mari Jinishian, who was able to substantially supplement the catalogue of voice documents of Sandburg that Caedmon had already published.

[12] That family included *Encounter, Der Monat, Preuves, Cuardernos* and *Hiwar* among other periodicals. Well-known American journals that were sponsored for international distribution at one time or another by the CIA also included the *Partisan Review, Kenyon Review, Sewanee Review, Hudson Review, Poetry, The Journal of History and Ideas* and *Daedalus* (332).

[13] Some of these CCF-sponsored journals had a specific impact on the canonization modernism, as in the case of William Carlos Williams who had not received recognition as a modern American writer but whose place in postwar American letters politically valuable in the postwar era precisely because he represented a uniquely American form of writing.

[14] The 1954 Ford Foundation film entitled *The Freedom to Read* appears to have played a role in this deflection. See *The New York Times*, May 19, 1954, p. 34.

[15] The origins of the ACCF were spelled out by Dr. Sidney Hook, a professor of Philosophy at Columbia who is prominently detailed in Stonor Saunder's book. According to Hook: "To censor Mr. Russell's intellectual activity because of some of his views on matters not germane to his chief theoretical interest are objectionable to some members of the community clearly contravenes the Statement of Academic Freedom

and Tenure adopted by both the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges. Any such attempt, if successful, would establish a dangerous precedent soon to be extended to all fields of scientific inquiry; it would open the way to imposing in the United States the worst features of the totalitarian regimes in German and Russian universities" (*The Bertrand Russell Case* 227). Many figures such as Hook were active in both the CCF and the ACCF.

[16] In private conversation with me, Mantell indicated that Jason Epstein, who was the editor of Anchor Books and who is a close friend of Mantell, published the Club at some juncture. However, in his recent memoir *Book Business* Epstein made no mention of the club and explicitly distanced himself from the CIA's network of cultural institutions.

[17] Disposition of Barbara Holdridge, p. 90.

[18] Mantell notes that while Ferlinghetti sold Caedmon records, he never asked that Caedmon make a recording of him. As she concedes frankly: "He wasn't saleable enough for us to do it." Ferlinghetti was recorded in 1957 on one of Fantasy Records' alternative or counter-culture recordings. Ferlinghetti's B-Side recording was coupled with Kenneth Rexroth's A-Side performance of "Thou Shalt Not Kill: In Memory of Dylan Thomas," which reclaimed Thomas as a counter-culture figure.

[19] Disposition of Barbara Holdridge, p. 92.

[20] Holdridge declined Laughlin's request on the grounds that these were "thoroughly innocuous" and "no more than our own affectionate reminiscences of Ezra at St. Elizabeth's." Holdridge's characterization of the narrative that was used to frame the Pound recording was in fact somewhat disingenuous. Her reply also seems to indicate that mediating Pound through such paratextual devices such as liner notes, album cover art, and reviews of his recordings was in fact more important than the so-called "content" of Pound's LP records.

[21] Beginning in 1953, Mantell's former employer Period Records in particular had licensed a number of French language theatrical recordings; it also flooded the field with number of French language *read text* recording by figures such as Albert Camus, Paul Claudel, André Gide and Cocteau himself.

[22] Unpublished letter from Shaun McLaughlin to S.J. Neiman, March 13, 1964.

[23] All of these themes are well in evidence in the opening lines of the poem:
KIA 6off.61.em. 13 Sept. 2400-14 Sept. 2400.
Translate.
Repeat after me sixtyseven times
I do
I do
I do, sixty-seven times
Continue
It is continued
In the next war we shall bury the dead in cellophane
In the next war we shall bury the dead in cellophane
The Host shall come packaged in every K ration

The Host shall come packaged in every K ratio
Every man will be provided with a small but perfect
        Archbishop Spellman, which shall be self-inflatable (courtesy
        of Air Reduction, opened—closed—previous—opened
        closed—)
You do not need to repeat this. There is not any ceremony anymore . . . .
All officers, warrant officers and enlisted men will be
        provided with a copy of their own true loves that they will
        never see again and all these copies will be returnable
        through the proper channels . . . . (107-8)

[24] Widely regarded as a Symbolist, Jiménez had been a prominent figure in early Spanish modernism. Like many others whom Caedmon recorded he was also a Nobel Prize winner.

[25] Thomas was one of the performers and because of the exclusivity clause that Caedmon enjoyed with the poet at the time of his death, Caedmon alone was in a position to release the recording commercially.

---

[26] Caedmon's assignment of recording numbers indicates that Caedmon TC 1011 *Peter Marshall Speaks* was undertaken after the label recorded Welty TC 1010 and before they recorded O'Casey TC 1012, in 1952, although it would later be re-assigned the foundational number TC 101. The Schwann catalogue first lists the recording only in 1955. This suggests that the recording may have enjoyed a period of indeterminate ideological publication before it was released as a commercial voice document.

[27] The marked weakness of his delivery suggests an alternative scenario—that it may well have been made near the end of his life. Thomas's performance is consistent with Holdridge's account of their very last recording as reported to Ferris, whenever that occurred, when the poet also had difficulty in pronouncing words (292).

[28] Sitwell's poetics were deeply influenced by her governess, Helen Rootham. The latter's English language translation of Rimbaud, the first English language translation of the poet, was published by Faber and Faber in 1925.

[29] The aesthetic of *Horizon* itself would be widely copied in the postwar period, particularly in the American periodical encyclopedia of the arts of the same name, so ardently castigated by Macdonald, which began to be published in 1958 as a supplement to the original *Horizon*.

Chapter Four
Spoken Texts and the Postmodern Shakespeare or A Return to the Scene of the European Modern

As noted in my last chapter, the composition—and therefore the disposition—of the Caedmon catalogue began to change in 1956. In this chapter, I detail the second phase of the Caedmon enterprise which involved the shift to *spoken text* recordings of historical poetry as read by actors during the waning of the LP moment in the late fifties. I also detail the third phase of the Caedmon enterprise, or the turn to theatrical recordings as the spoken word content of "the stereo moment," which began in 1960 with the founding the Shakespeare Recording Society and which accelerated with the founding of the Theatrical Recording Society in 1964. The fourth and final phase of the Caedmon enterprise began in 1964. It involved the turn to the large-scale production educational recordings and was shaped by federal funding initiatives to introduce audio and audiovisual materials into classrooms across America on a large-scale.

Finally, I turn to the sequence of events that led to the sale of Caedmon to Raytheon Corporation as a conglomerate at the heart of America's "military-industrial complex" and the post-acquisition period between 1970 and 1975 when Holdridge and Mantell worked for Caedmon as salaried executives. I suggest that this acquisition was representative of a larger global shift in the structure of American capital, which spelled the end of America's mid-size publishing houses and recording companies as autonomous fields of symbolic production. The penetration of both fields by military industrial capital effectively brought the era of postwar mass culture and postwar print publishing to a close.

From the mid 1950s to the early 1960s, the Caedmon catalogue turned from modern and contemporary poetry to the larger textual tradition. This phenomenon was also related to postwar media shift, to the social aging of poetry in wartime, and to America' larger reading crusade if not Cold War author cult *per se*. It involved the translation of the legacy of modern literature, as a print-technologized phenomenon, into postmodern secondary voice media. This supplemental voicing often ideologically centered literary texts as these became subject to the disposition of particular actor's voices and of particular performance regimes, including regimes of secondary orality such as "film voice" or "radio voice." It involved not only the substitution of the sound of the reader's own voice, subvocalizing as he or she read in Garrett Stewart's terms, but also a stripping of historical aura as literary texts came into contact with other media cultures in the production of postmodern public speech and a larger postmodern secondary voice culture.

Caedmon's turn to Shakespeare also underscored the mid-century recycling of the textual and cultural tradition in a moment media and cultural shift as part of the broader scene of the postmodern; it was also related to a narrower phenomenon that I label the postmodern Shakespeare as a supplement to theatrical performance as the foundation of the modern public sphere and to the textual Shakespeare as the basis of a modern education. These supplemental productions—to the English literary tradition and Shakespearean dramatic tradition—ultimately represented a return to the European modern in postmodern media of secondary literacy and secondary orality as postmodern supplements to the role of poetry and theater in the consolidation of the European modern— as part of the political unconscious of the LP medium.

The Caedmon venture was initially conceived of as a project to record "the outstanding authors of our time." That mandate began to change with reference to the need to constantly generate new product, however, and in the course of being asked to judge a poetry contest late in 1952, Caedmon's founders met a young man whose talents dramatically changed the disposition of the Caedmon venture. As Holdridge recalls: "For one reason or another, we had been invited to an evening of poetry reading at the home of a society woman . . . . It was a beautiful evening fueled by cocktails. We listened to these young poets reading their work, and the one that stood out beyond a doubt was Howard Sackler. He read beautifully. He had a beautiful speaking voice. His poetry was stunning. He was young, beautiful, with blond curly hair." Needless to say, Sackler won the contest. Holdridge recalls that in the course of talking with him afterwards, she and Mantell determined that Sackler had "two arrows in his bow." As she recalls: "He was a poet and he was a theatrical director . . . [who] was directing off, off, off Broadway plays." The two women of Caedmon invited Sackler to drop by their office. As Holdridge recalls: "We talked, batted things around, and talked about publishing his poetry. But we also talked about the possibility of doing something called *Hearing Poetry*."

Caedmon subsequently published a book of Sackler's poetry—entitled *Want My Shepard*—in 1954.[1] However, it was Sackler's services as a director that would prove of most use to the company. From moment when Holdridge and Mantell met Sackler, the Caedmon catalogue began to evolve away from *read text* recordings of contemporary literature towards *spoken text* recordings of historical literature. As Holdridge frames this transition: "We sort of ran out of people to record—people whom we respected, authors—and started to think about actors. That was a beautiful progression. And that's when we met Howard." Mantell also suggests that Caedmon evolved in a new direction after they met Sackler. As she recalls: "The concept of non-poets doing poetry is perfectly obvious. There aren't enough good poets to go around. The distributors say, 'What do you mean, one record a year?' You can't pay your rent that way. And then Howard showed up, and there was an easy solution to that." Mantell remembers their meeting with Sackler slightly differently. She recalls that they first met him at a poetry reading at the Museum of Modern Art. However, like Holdridge, she recalls that very shortly they met Sackler, both agreed that he had a role to play in their company. As Mantell recalls: "We decided that he was our kind of guy. Very smart, very talented, a very good negotiator. Always a little greedier than he needed to be—or what we were comfortable with—but he was a major force in the financial success [of Caedmon]."

Hearing Poetry was Sackler's first contribution to the Caedmon enterprise. *Volume I: Chaucer to Milton* featured actors Hurd Hatfield, Frank Silvera and Jo Van Fleet reading selections from the works of Spenser, Marlowe, Shakespeare, Johnson, Donne and Herbert. *Volume II: Dyden to Browning* featured the same actors' performances of selections from the works of Congreve, Pope, Blake, Coleridge, Wordsworth, Keats, Shelley and Byron. Each record featured a short introduction by Mark Van Doren.[2] Turns in the Caedmon catalogue seem to have been generally framed in terms of a shortage of available poets. However, other forces were clearly at work—including the bottom line. Company correspondence indicates that educators and found these recordings and the accompanying booklets highly useful. From their point of view, the market was saturated with recordings of modern or contemporary poetry. They were urging Caedmon to provide recordings of what they termed "classical"—or historical—literature. *Hearing Poetry* was announced in May of 1954; by December of that year, three other *spoken text records* had been released. The first of these was a recording of Judith Anderson reading the poems of Edna St. Vincent Millay.[3] Actor Alfred Drake was recorded reading selections from Edward Fitzgerald's *The Rubyáiyat of Omar Khayyám* and Matthew Arnold's *Sohrab and Rustum.* Basil Rathbone, who had been a "narrator" or reader on the earlier Columbia Records' *Masterpieces of Literature* series, also made a recording of the prose and poetry of Edgar Allan Poe.

Sackler's expertise was a vital element in the turn to actors' recordings because although Holdridge and Mantell felt comfortable recording poets and authors reading their works aloud they did not feel competent to direct actors. As Mantell explains: "An actor is an instrument. That instrument needs someone to play it—and the director plays it." Actors were interested in making recordings, but many did not know how to read poetry aloud. Public poetry reading by actors was common, particularly over the airwaves, on the other side of the Atlantic, where some actors—and even some poets such as Dylan Thomas—were effectively professional readers. It was a relatively new practice in America, however. As Mantell recalls: "All the actors were reluctant because they wondered if they read well enough." Caedmon's early *spoken text* recordings indicate that actors' voices sometimes drifted in and out of various performance styles—slipping from conversational or intimate spoken "film English" into Shakespearean theatrical declamation, for example—in ways that did not reflect the prosody of the works these actors were reading. The task of rehearsing actors—or of teaching them how to read poetry—fell to Sackler.

As Mantell recalls: "By 1955, certainly, when we went to California, Howard had got himself into the role of rehearsing the actors." Mantell and Sackler undertook this trip in the fall of that year specifically in order to record actors. They recorded James Mason reading the verse of Robert Browning and Vincent Price reading the poetry of Percy Bysshe Shelley. Cecil Hardwicke recorded an album of seventeenth-century metaphysical poetry and another of Wordsworth's poetry. Eva Le Gallienne and Louis Jourdan also made Caedmon's first French-language recording—of Charles Baudelaire's *Les Fleurs du Mal.* Finally, Brandan de Wilde and Walter Brennan performed the stories of Mark Twain as Caedmon's first foray into the area of popular American fiction.[4] This trip appears to have been undertaken at least partially at the behest of James Mason, who was willing to record for Caedmon but not to come to New York in order to do so. However, such was the prestige of the Caedmon venture that actors were also beginning to approach the label in New York. As Holdridge recalls: "Agents would call—'How about Tyrone Power doing love poems?' We'd say, 'Tyrone Power, yes! Love poems, no!' That's an actual example of what we turned down which might have made money but which would have turned the stomach." The heartthrob was recorded reading several poems of the "romantic" poet Lord Byron in November of 1955.

These *spoken text* recordings were slowly released throughout the latter half of the 1950s, augmenting the company's catalogue of *read text* recordings as performed by modern poets and authors themselves. With the expansion of Caedmon's mandate to include *spoken text* recordings of historical literature made by actors, Caedmon began to generate significantly more revenue. At this juncture, new *spoken text* genres were also introduced, including Caedmon's profitable line of children's recordings. The record company published a recording of Rathbone reading Oscar Wilde's *Fairy Tales* and a recording of Boris Karloff reading Rudyard's Kipling's *Just So* stories that year.[5] Karloff would make nineteen albums for Caedmon including many of Kipling's popular children's stories.[6] As Mantell justifies these: "There was a time when you run out of Keats, Byron, Shelley . . . so you move down." The turn to children's recordings is also framed by Mantell terms of maintaining a network of distributors. As she notes: "If you are going to maintain your distributors, if you expect to him to have a steady order of something, you have to consider how they are going to sell fifty or sixty copies." The production of children's records intensified throughout the late 1950s and the early 1960s. As Mantell elaborates: "It's like when we are deciding what to do next . . . . The children are growing, and we said, "*A Child's Garden of Verses*—We could sell that." As Mantell explains of Caedmon's expansion into the grade school market: "It's a search for a wider audience. It's going down to the grade schools and the elementary schools. There's no market for the works of Socrates. However, there is a market for Carl Sandburg's *The Rootabaga Stories.* So you get Eve Merrian, *Poems for Children.* These are reaching out to a younger audience—a less abstrusely rarified audience."

Another supplemental *spoken text* recording genre that emerged in 1957 involved Caedmon's series of Biblical recordings, which were clearly undertaken in the spirit of paying lip service to the religious disposition of America's Cold War Crusade. In general, crusade "discourse" was underwritten by the ideological goal of projecting the idea that Americans were a spiritual people abroad and by the anticommunist crusade in Europe in particular in so which so many film actors were involved. In this way, the Bible became the content of postmodern mass media and postmodern media systems. While the religious disposition of America's Cold War Crusade was best exemplified by its film industry, crusade "discourse" was a global phenomenon within the field of media as a whole. All of America's cultural industries—including its print publishing, sound recording, and broadcasting industries—were engaged with "crusade" discourse. Caedmon's offerings in the genre involved Claire Bloom and Judith Anderson reading the *Book of Judith* and *the Book of Ruth*, a second recording of Anderson reading the *Book of Psalms* and the so-called "Tale of David," and James Mason's performance of *Ecclesiastes*; the following year, Caedmon released another recording of Anderson reading the *Book of Genesis*. Caedmon's offerings in this sub-genre were comparatively few. Significantly, they focused on *spoken text* recordings of the Old Testament as part of the shared Judeo-Christian religious tradition.

Another *spoken text* genre that emerged in 1958 involved the turn to recordings of democratic political rhetoric. That turn began with the release of *Great American Speeches* as a recording that featured Carl Sandburg reading foundational acts of American political rhetoric aloud, including Patrick Henry's "Liberty or Death" speech, the inaugural Presidential addresses of George Washington and Thomas Jefferson, and Abraham Lincoln's "The Gettysburg Address." Other readers on the album included Vincent Price, Ed Begley and Melvin Douglas. *Great American Speeches* represented the consolidation of a nationalist emphasis in the Caedmon catalogue that would intensify in the years to come.[7] A characteristic dialectic between nationalism and cosmopolitanism appears to have consolidated in the catalogue at the same time. In addition to Mann's German-language *read text* recording and Jourdan's *spoken text* French-language recording, Caedmon had recorded Gabriela Mistral and had released three theatrical Spanish language recordings of the *Compañía Española de Teatro*

Universal. Another instance of foreign language recordings was a 1958 German-language recording made by the actress Lotte Lehmann, who was recorded reading a selection of German lyric poetry including that of Goethe, Heine and Rilke. Lehmann also performed excerpts of von Hofmannsthal's *Der Rosenkavalier* as poetry that had originally been set to music.

Caedmon's body of foreign language recording also expanded as the result of a trip that Holdridge made to Mexico that was undertaken specifically to record Diego Rivera. Holdridge recalls that customs authorities confiscated this interview recording upon her return to New York, but that the tapes were later returned to her—apparently untouched and unplayed—some months later. Neither of Caedmon's founders has elaborated on why they chose to record the Mexican socialist whose portrait of Lenin was had been memorably removed from the lobby of the Rockefeller Center. However, recordings of non-Stalinist socialists were by no means a rarity in the Caedmon catalogue particularly with reference to the label's Spanish and French language recordings. To some extent, these recordings exemplified the mediation or containment of "dissent." Once again, McLuhan's axiom "the medium is the message" is highly relevant in that the disposition of the LP medium in general and that of the Caedmon catalogue more narrowly may have been more important than the contents of individual recordings. It was the disposition of the overall catalogue, and the disposition or "massage" of the LP medium that was at issue in their production—rather than sales figures of any single LP.[8]

As a side benefit of her trip to Mexico, Holdridge was able to augment the body of Caedmon's Spanish language LPs by recording actors Maria Douglas and Raul Dantes reading the poetry of Federico García Lorca. Clearly, the latter record was part of the second face of modernism in the Spanish-language and *spoken text* modalities. However, to some degree this record, like that of Rivera, also reflected the mediation of dissent and the larger cultural politics of mediation in the Latin American context. On a certain level, the production of these Spanish language recordings like those of the *Compañía Española de Teatro Universal* were seemingly haunted by OWI/USIA discourse even as they were undoubtedly commercial voice documents.[9]

By 1958, *spoken text* recording had clearly displaced *read text* literary recordings. Other recordings of actors released that year included Anthony Quayle and Katherine

Cornell's performance of Elizabeth Barrett Browning's *Sonnets from the Portuguese*. Ralph Richardson also undertook to make two poetry recordings for Caedmon in 1958. The first of these was a recording of the poetry of John Keats; the second involved a performance of works by Samuel Taylor Coleridge. However, by far the most important *spoken text* recording to have been released in 1958 was a recording of *Palgrave's Golden Treasury*—the British poetry anthology that had been so reviled by Ezra Pound. For Pound, *Palgrave's Golden Treasury* was an example of the reifying effect electroplate printing had had on the field of literary production. Essentially, Pound suggested that poetry had become reified with the introduction of electroplate printing in 1884 as a moment in the industrial or mass production of books as symbolic commodities (*How to Read* 18). Electroplate printing involved adding another step into the electro-mechanical process of printing, which began with hot-type linoleum typesetting; that step involved the photographic reproduction of print as image. Electroplate printing is part of the technologization of the word and the history of sense-differentiated image-based mass media as a visual "regime" more narrowly—against which the typographically dissonant performances of literary modernism arose as a dialectical counter-formation. In effect, Caedmon translated *The Palgrave Treasury* during another moment of technical shift. Its *Palgrave Treasury* featured performances of the verse of Marlowe, Shakespeare, Dryden, Lovelace, Milton, Goldsmith, Keats, Wordsworth, Byron, Shelley, Coleridge, Tennyson and Arnold—as performed by Claire Bloom, Eric Portmann and John Neville.

The turn to *spoken text* recordings began with Howard Sackler, but it intensified largely as the result of a relationship that Caedmon developed with a particular theatrical agent at the MCA theatrical agency whose name was Milton Goldman. Although Caedmon had some success in recruiting well-known radio and film actors, until this juncture many of the actors who recorded for the label came from Sackler's "off, off, off Broadway" connections. After Goldman became involved, classically trained British stage actors replaced these. Mantell credits Goldman with playing a big part in the success of the actors' recordings and in persuading the right actors to participate. As she recalls: "Milton represented a great many big-name actors and Milton was instrumental in us getting together with them because Milton said: 'You should do this.' And if an agent has been good to you—gotten you the right roles, gotten you the right payment for those roles, and gotten you the proper billing—you're going to listen to him." Not only did Goldman get actors that Holdridge and Mantell wanted, he often made suggestions to Caedmon about which actors were appropriate for particular projects. As Mantell recalls: "We would say, "We want to do'—whatever it was—and Milton would say, 'So and so is around. He'd be perfect for this.'" As Mantell remembers: "Milton probably got us Ralph Richardson." She also recalls that it was Goldman who first suggested the services of Anthony Quayle—an actor who had also been a director of the Shakespeare Memorial Theatre—who subsequently undertook to make a great many recordings for Caedmon.

As Mantell recalls: "Milton understood what we were trying to do. He understood that it was no skin off the back of any of his names to make these recordings but rather that the good actors—I would say the great actors—wanted to learn how to read poetry. They'd been to the Royal Academy and learned how to read Shakespeare, but this was different, you know. Howard spent a lot of time with these guys, rehearsing. They were willing to give it the time. They wanted to do it well." Astonishingly, actors such as Richardson were paid the same as other actors. As Mantell recalls: "They didn't do it for the money—and we couldn't have done it with poor starving actors who were unknowns."

While Goldman was a major part in Caedmon's ability to record film and stage actors who happened to be passing through New York, his influence and connections were even more important in preparing the groundwork for the shift to dramatic recordings of theatrical productions undertaken on the other side of the Atlantic beginning in 1960. As Mantell recalls: "Milton was a very major force in the acting side of the business. When I went to London, Milton informed the head of their office, MCA London, a guy named Lawrence Evans, so I was able to get people over there and Howard [Sackler] was able to build on connections I had created." These connections would play a major role in the turn to theatrical recordings during "the stereo moment."

Caedmon did not convert to stereo until 1960 but even in 1958 the Caedmon catalogue began to reflect the overall shift to theatrical recordings as the content of the stereo moment. Caedmon released a recording of a British production of Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice* starring Michael Redgrave that year and a recording of William Butler Yeats' translation of *Oedipus Rex* as performed by Stratford, Ontario Shakespeare

Festival Players. The label also recorded *Wellsprings of Drama*, which featured performances of the liturgical rituals that formed the historical basis of English drama in a New York production included Sackler regulars Frank Silvera, Frederick Worlock and Darren McGavin. These dramatic recording experiments provided the framework to consider how to best approach theatrical recording projects as a whole. Before Caedmon could produce these new kinds of recordings, it needed to find ways of offsetting their much higher production costs as plays, and particularly those with large casts, were much more expensive to record than spoken word recordings of a single speaker. A recording of one person performing is a relatively "cheap product," according to Mantell. In contrast, a thirty-character play is an "expensive product." As Holdridge recalls: "We eventually started doing plays only when we really had money."

In the meantime, the Caedmon catalogue continued to rely on *spoken text* recordings. These seem to have provided at least some of the capital needed to expand into stereo recording. Caedmon introduced a new *spoken text* genre in 1958, in the form of prose recordings of historical fiction. Recordings of this type included Edmund O'Brien's performance of Hart Crane's *The Red Badge of Courage* and Hurd Hatfield's performance of Oscar Wilde's *The Picture of Dorian Grey.* Others included Siobahnn McKenna reading excerpts from Daniel Defoe's *Moll Flanders* and Anthony Quayle's recording of Samuel Boswell's *A London Journal*. Caedmon also continued to extend its *spoken text* Biblical recordings in 1958. It released a second recording from the archive of recorded sermons left behind by Chaplain of Congress Peter Marshall that consisted of Marshall's reading of the Book of Job. It also published an unusual recording that paired an A-Side reading of *The Song of Songs* with a B-Side *spoken text* performance of the letters of Heloise and Abelard as performed by Claire Bloom, Claude Rains and Nancy Wickwire. Finally, Caedmon also expanded its series of *spoken text* children's recordings with the release of Michael Redgrave's performance of the fairytales of Hans Christian Anderson, the second volume of Boris Karloff's performance of Rudyard Kipling's *Just So* stories, and a recording of *Oklahoma!* star Celeste Holm reading *Mother Goose* nursery rhymes.

Caedmon's line of *spoken text* children's recordings became even more prominent in 1959. Michael Redgrave's reading of excepts from Jonathan Swift's *Gulliver's*

Travels was released that year, as was the third volume of Karloff's performances of the short stories of Rudyard Kipling; a second recording of the fairytales of Hans Christian Anderson as read by Karloff and Judith Anderson was also released. Other children's recordings included Cyril Cusack's performance of *The Little Flowers of Francis of Assisi*, Carole Channing's performance of the Madeleine Stories, and two recordings of Stan Holloway performing excerpts from Lewis Carroll's *Alice in Wonderland*. The final children's LP released that year involved a recording of the *Bab Ballads* of W.S. Gilbert and the *Cautionary Verses* of Hilaire Belloc as read by Holloway and Joyce Grenfell.[10] At the other end of the cultural spectrum, Caedmon released a Japanese-language record devoted to performances of the Noh dramas *Kantan* and *Hogoromo* as sung and performed by two of that nation's foremost theatrical companies. At this juncture, the Caedmon catalogue was clearly interpolating more kitschy elements, such as its line of children's recordings, with a much smaller body of relatively highbrow voice documents with very limited audiences such as the Noh recordings.

Spoken text recordings of modern and modernist literature became particularly prominent in 1959. Ed Begley's performance of selections from Walt Whitman's *Leaves of Grass* and an album devoted to the poetry of Gerard Manley Hopkins as read by Cyril Cusack were released that year. Along with Siobahn McKenna, Cusack also performed on a recording devoted to the poetry of William Butler Yeats, and on the second of Caedmon's records devoted to the works of James Joyce, which included two chapters from *Finnegans Wake*, "Anna Livia Plurabelle" and "Shem the Penman." Ralph Richardson's performance of excerpts of Marcel Proust's *Remembrance of Things Past* and Celia Johnson's performance of excerpts from Virginia Woolf's *Mrs. Dalloway* were two other examples of *spoken text* translations of modernist literature that were released in 1959. Another experiment in *spoken text* recording involved a recording of the letters of George Bernard Shaw and Ellen Terry as performed by Cyril Cusack and Peggy Ashcroft. Reflecting the overall prominence of Shaw in the catalogue, a recording of Noel Coward reading his own poetry and selections from *The Applecart* along with actress Margaret Leighton was released that year. Clearly, at this juncture the *spoken text* catalogue was mediating the translation of modern literature and literary modernism in particular in ways that are consistent with Raymond Williams' analysis of "the two faces of Modernism" as a universal culture.

However, in 1960 the Caedmon catalogue underwent a major shift with the turn to Shakespearean drama as the spoken word content of "the stereo moment." That Marshall McLuhan could only describe mid-century media shift in *The Gutenberg Galaxy* by using a Shakespearean rhetoric testifies the importance of different technologically mediated versions of Shakespearean speech in the age of postmodern mass media—and indeed to Caedmon Records' role within that larger shift. With the turn to Shakespeare as Britain's national poet, the field of spoken word recording returned to iambic pentameter or blank verse as a "national P.A. system" in the terms outlined by McLuhan. In essence, Caedmon was returning to the scene of metered verse—and to the sonnet and dramatic iambic pentameter as forms of poetic "discourse"—as the scene of modern poetry. With the turn to Shakespeare, Caedmon also turned to theatrical performance as the foundation of the public sphere in the terms outlined by Jurgen Habermas. Effectively, that turn was the basis of a postmodern public sphere based on media of secondary orality.

In technical terms, stereo recording introduced new technical qualities into spoken word recording. The high signal-to-noise ratio that was typical of the era of recordings of single speaking voices in the monaural era, which had been fetishized to some extent in recordings of so-called "great voices," was displaced by the effect of different voices speaking from different locations in the secondary or playback context. For many years after its introduction, spoken word recording featured particularly spatial effects such as people walking across a room in high heels from one speaker to another, or the crisp sound of a match being struck at a particular location in the secondary or simulated playback context. These sound fetishes effectively simulated spatial indices in secondary or playback performance contents. They were very different from the monological nature of monaural LP sound and voice documents. To the degree that they involved a reproduction or a simulation of the voice of an intimate speaking to an undifferentiated audience in heterogeneous secondary playback and mass transmission contexts, voice-documents of the monaural era facilitated one-way vocal inscription via technologies of secondary orality. Stereo voice recording, in contrast, involved a simulation of dialogue in the secondary or playback context.

Fundamentally, stereo involved the combination of vertical and lateral disc recording and playback. Early forms of binaural or stereo recording had first been developed in Britain in 1931 but stereo was not perfected until the postwar period.[11] Stereo was first demonstrated in the U.S. at the 1952 Audio Fair, but costs were too prohibitive for it to be developed commercially. Stereo was first introduced into the pre-recorded reel-to-reel tape market in the United States in 1954; it was initially associated with the distinctive cachet of audiotape as the audiophile's preferred recording and playback medium. However, established interests in the LP industry held back on introducing stereo until recording standards and patents could be standardized and it was introduced to the American LP industry on a global scale only in 1958. As a result, the existing interests in the field of sound recording with America, including such relatively small producers as Caedmon, were able to consider how best to apply the new innovation commercially.

The application of stereo to the Caedmon enterprise was instantly apparent to Holdridge the first time she heard the new medium. As she recalls: "I remember the first time I heard stereo at a friend's house. I was bowled over. The application of it was absolutely obvious of course—that we should do stereo. Plays lend themselves to stereo." However, at the same time that Holdridge concedes the technical import of stereo with reference to theatrical productions, she also insists that the shortage of poets was another factor that was involved in the turn to dramatic recordings. As she recalls: "The other factor was that we were running out of respectable poets and authors to record."

As recounted by both Holdridge and Mantell, turns in the Caedmon catalogue seem to have been generally framed in terms of a shortage of available poets. However, it is generally acknowledged within the sound recording industry that moments of new sound recording and playback media require new forms of secondary performance genres as their so-called "content." These secondary performance genres initially sell the new medium—and more essentially the hardware system—even as they subsequently become reified. These secondary performance genres are also clearly related to the historicity of primary or non-mediated musical and spoken word performance genres that are part of the wider culture during the "moment" of each new playback medium.

Like the earlier divide between partial and full spectrum recording, then, monaural/stereo LP recording was effectively a moment of technical divide. For this reason, the secondary performance genres during the monaural and stereo eras were substantially different. Musical stereo recording was driven by rock music as a supplement to classical music, jazz, and opera music as the content of the moments of the monaural LP and electrical and mechanical era gramophone discs eras respectively. Similarly, the genres of secondary orality at play during the stereo moment were substantially different than those of the monaural LP moment. While stereo generally leant itself to dramatic recording, the spoken word theatrical content of "the stereo moment" was related more narrowly to the revival of Shakespearean theater in Britain during the postwar period. The spoken word content of the stereo moment, then, like the mid-century poetry reading, was historically rather than technically determined. It reflected the postwar revival of Britain's national theatrical tradition and that of Shakespeare in particular. This revival was part of a broader revival of the performing and fine arts during the postwar period as an "engine" of British cultural identity—as waged against the influence of postwar mass culture. To some extent, that revival also reflected the politicization of drama in the service of cultural consensus in postwar Britain as well as the larger politicization of drama globally during the Cold War period.

That Shakespeare became the spoken word content of the stereo moment was due in part to the lead that British recorders enjoyed over the American sound recording industry with reference to stereo recording. Argo—Caedmon's main global competitor in spoken word recordings—had converted to the medium in 1957. Argo had established a spoken word position in the field of stereo recording by releasing recordings of Shakespearean plays as the spoken word content of that medium under the imprint of the Marlowe Recording Society. Argo had been founded as a British competitor to Caedmon; while it followed Caedmon's lead in producing *read* and *spoken text* poetry recordings, it took the lead in the production of Shakespeare on LP. The first in these series recordings became available in America beginning in 1959.[12] Part of the distinctiveness of that series was the combination of Shakespearean theatrical performance and ensemble music—which was heightened by effect of stereo. (The fact that Caedmon undertook a Sackler-directed production of Christopher Marlowe's *The*

Tragical History of Doctor Faustus in New York in 1957, which starred Frank Silvera and Darren McGavin and featured an elaborate musical score, suggests that it was attempting to compete with the Argo series.)

However, while Caedmon's Shakespeare Recording Society, which was founded in 1960 as a project to record the entire dramatic verse oeuvre of Shakespeare, reflected the revival of Shakespearean theatre in Britain and clearly represented the mediation of this revival for American mass audiences as well as an attempt to compete with Argo internationally, it cannot be understood purely from within that framework. That recording project clearly also represented the social aging of the W.P.A./Mercury Theater Shakespeare, as this around the figures of Orson Welles and John Houseman most notably. Both men were central to mid-century history of Shakespeare on stage as well as the postmodern or mass-mediated Shakespeare. Not only did they stage the so-called "Voodoo *Macbeth*" in Harlem and the legendary anti-fascist *Julius Caesar* as key events in American theater history, both directors were active in anti-fascist cultural warfare (Welles through his involvement in the production of films for the OWI in the Latin American context and Houseman as the first director of the VOA). Houseman went on to direct a 1953 film version of the anti-fascist *Julius Caesar* with Joseph Mankiewicz, and subsequently played an important role in establishing Shakespeare festivals and Shakespearean repertory theater programs within America—most notably as the first director of Julliard's Theater Program. Welles is more properly at the center of the postmodern Shakespeare as a phenomenon that involved both the ideological recuperation of the legacy of Shakespeare in the service of the creation of postmodern public sphere, and the foundation of postwar "mass culture" as "mass education."

Even as America had a vigorous and long-standing tradition of Shakespeare on stage, it is only in the context of the larger American mass mediation of Shakespeare that Caedmon's full-length unabridged LP productions can be fully understood. As framed by historians of the mass mediated Shakespeare such as Kenneth Rothwell, Douglas Lanier and Robert F. Willson Jr., that continuum of adaptation/appropriation extends from staged film and occasionally television treatments that follow the Shakespearean text with little or no structural changes to the script; to "adaptations" of Shakespeare such as Welles' *Citizen Kane* or Warhol's *Blowjob*; to comedic Shakespeareana as mounted on radio programs hosted by Jack Benny, Fred Allen and Edgar Bergen; to popular sci-fi films such as *Forbidden Planet* as an adaptation of *The Tempest*—to name but a few of many possible examples.[13] This proliferation of the legacy Shakespeare in postmodern mass media also effected its liquidation to some extent.

Mass mediations of Shakespeare included film, television and radio adaptations. Film adaptations of Shakespeare were the oldest of these. That appropriation was continuous even as it was also associated with the "moment" of silent film. As outlined by Kenneth Rothwell, there were forty-three adaptations of Shakespeare alone from 1899 to 1914 as produced in the UK, the USA, Italy and France (299-300). Only a slightly larger number—fifty-seven films—were produced during a similar fifteen-year period after the war that extended from 1945 to 1960. Significantly, while the UK and the USA led in the production of such films, Shakespearean film culture was clearly internationalized in the postwar period, which saw the introduction of Shakespearean film productions or film adaptations of Shakespearean plot lines in films that originated from Germany, Japan, India, and the USSR and elsewhere as part of the globalization of Shakespeare in film as a mass medium. This period was marked by the dialogue between Shakespearean directors, as waged by figures such as Olivier and Welles, Kurasawa and Kozintsev, and later Godard and Warhol. While other figures are clearly important—and most notably Kurasawa, who made four Shakespeare-influenced films during this period—the dialectic between Olivier and Welles seems particularly so given the struggle between Americans and British to control the cultural legacy of Shakespeare not only on stage but also as the foundation of a postmodern global film culture.[14]

Electronic adaptations of Shakespeare were also important in the American context. Television broadcasts of Shakespearean plays were frequent during the early days of American television. Indeed, these highbrow offerings appear to have legitimated the new medium. NBC and ABC both broadcast productions of Shakespeare in 1949 in the form of productions of *Henry V* and *Othello*; CBS also broadcast productions of *Coriolanus* and *Macbeth* in 1951. Hallmark Theater, which was broadcast on various networks, involved the most sustained commitment to the Bard: works that were presented between 1953 and 1960 included *Hamlet, Richard II, Twelfth Night* and *The Tempest* (Rothwell 309-340). These productions were part of the social aging of the

New Deal educational radio programming, which was provided by the commercial broadcasters on a voluntary basis in conjunction with various Federal Works radio projects that had been undertaken in the mid and late 1930ss. One expression of that legacy was the Ford Foundation sponsored TV/Radio Workshop, which funded the NBC television program *Omnibus* among others. *Omnibus*—which was the first program to play Dylan Thomas recordings over the air in 1953—also broadcast a production of *King Lear* starring Welles that year (Rothwell 83). Peter Wood directed that production and would subsequently undertake many SRS recordings for Caedmon.

Radio adaptations of Shakespeare began in the late 1920s and intensified in the late 1930s and are even more important in terms of the pre-history of the Caedmon enterprise. NBC was a key player in this field. Its commitment to the Bard began in 1929 and involved radio performances of almost all of Shakespeare's plays during a period that extended to 1938 (Lanier 218). Other NBC radio Shakespeare series were mounted as part of *Great Plays* series, which ran from 1938 to 1941. Various Shakespeare-themed radio productions also ran from the late 1940s until the late 1950s. CBS was equally prolific: its contribution included the Columbia Workshop series, which ran from 1936 to 1940, and the 1937 Columbia Shakespeare Cycle, which featured radio adaptations of Shakespearean plays as directed by Archibald MacLeish, Brewster Morgan and Gilbert Seldes (Lanier 195-220). Orson Welles also used the Mercury Theater Company to broadcast *Hamlet* and *Julius Caesar* along with radio adaptations of literary works beginning in 1938 (Brady 614). Welles also directed productions of *Julius Caesar, Twelfth Night* and *The Merchant of Venice* for the CBS *Calvalcade of Literature* series, which aired in 1941. Welles subsequently mounted a Mercury Summer Theater of the Air production of *King Lear* in 1946. Arguably, the first Mercury Theater Shakespeare productions—which were part of the Campbell Playhouse radio series—can be viewed as the scene of the postmodern as a commercially sponsored form of highbrow midcult that was disseminated electronically. (It is certainly relevant to read Andy Warhol's Campbell's soup-can series as icons of postmodern culture in the light of this history.)

As it centers on the figure of Welles, the scene of the postmodern involves the interplay between primary theatrical and mass-mediated theatrical performance, the scene of commercially sponsored mass culture and the scene of postmodern (mass) education—largely in the service of an antifascist political agenda and in the consolidation of what might be termed the postmodern public sphere.[15] Welles' attempt to record each of Shakespeare's plays on gramophone discs, as published by Columbia Records in the late 1930s, is also part of the broader cultural history of the Wellesian Shakespeare and of the pre-history of the Caedmon SRS series more narrowly. As detailed by Michael Anderegg, Welles originally collaborated with Roger Hill, his former teacher at the Todd School for Boys, on a series of textual editions of *Julius Caesar, Twelfth Night* and *The Merchant of Venice*. These were entitled *Everybody's Shakespeare* and were published by the Todd School in 1934 (39). These performance-oriented guides were meant to give high school students and teachers ideas about how to stage Shakespearean productions; as such, they were a supplement to the textual Shakespeare in educational contexts. Later, Welles made sound recordings of each of these plays as part of the Mercury Text Recording Series.

Despite this pre-history, the field of theatrical sound recordings on LP was relatively small at the time that Caedmon launched the SRS series in 1960. The field of theatrical recordings in general was small; poetry and prose recordings were still the major spoken word genres. Unlike its earlier pioneering role in poetry recordings, this time Caedmon performed a number of existing *positions* in the field of theatrical recordings. The major American interests in the field were Decca, Columbia, and RCA-Victor, all of which had recorded a number of Shakespearean plays. Smaller independent recording companies occupied the rest of the positions in the field of theatrical recordings, the most important of which was Angel Records. With the important exception of Columbia, the innovator of the LP medium, European labels dominated the field of theatrical recordings. Angel was affiliated with Britain's EMI, Decca was an affiliate of the original English Decca and RCA-Victor retained is longstanding association with HMV.

In launching a series of sound recordings devoted to the works of Shakespeare, Caedmon was clearly attempting to compete with recordings of Shakespeare that were being produced at Cambridge University with the support of the British Arts Council. The disposition of the Marlowe Recording Society or MRS series was educational and amateur. While leading British actors took part anonymously, Cambridge tradition forbade them from being identified and distinguished from the student casts. In December of 1960, the MRS series consisted of productions of *As You Like It, Coriolanus, Henry IV, Julius Caesar, King John, A Lover's Complaint, Macbeth, Measure for Measure, The Merchant of Venice, Othello, Richard II, Romeo and Juliet, Troilus and Cressida* and *A Winter's Tale.* Secondary competitors in the field of Shakespearean sound recordings consisted of the Spoken Arts label, which had been founded in 1956 by Arthur Luce Klein, and the educational Spoken Word label, which had been founded by the Chicago educational radio broadcaster George E. Probst. Both distributed Dublin Gate Theatre productions of Shakespearean plays in the United States. (Once again, there is an Orson Welles connection in that the Dublin Gate Theatre was where Welles made his first appearance as professional actor, and was one to which he retained close ties.) In 1960, Spoken Arts had published a Dublin Gate production of *Macbeth.* Spoken Word, a more substantive player in the field of theatrical recordings, had published Dublin Gate productions of *A Midsummer Night's Dream, Much Ado About Nothing, Romeo and Juliet, The Taming of the Shrew* and *Twelfth Night.*

Launched in 1960, the Shakespeare Recording Society involved Caedmon's project to record the complete works of Shakespeare in unabridged three and four-disc sets. It included each of the thirty-eight plays as well as recordings of Shakespeare's sonnets. These recordings were made in England under the direction of Howard Sackler. Rather than recording any particular British Shakespearean production, Caedmon assembled what it termed "ideal casts." Typically, most of these cast members included the classically trained actors who were most closely associated with the Shakespearean revival in Britain including Anthony Quayle, John Gielgud, Ralph Richardson, Paul Scofield, Albert Finney, Max Adrian, Peggy Ashcroft, Margaret Leighton, Gwen Ffrangcon-Davies and Rachel Kempson among others. In contrast to the amateur disposition of the MRS series, Caedmon's had star power. Caedmon essentially brought first-rate productions of Shakespearean plays within reach of anyone with a record player. Using the highest production values and highly creative means of marketing its product, Caedmon aimed the SRS series towards the popular or trade market—or the five percent of Americans whom Holdridge and Mantell traditionally defined as sharing their own tastes and interests—while also clearly gearing the series towards the American educational market, and thirdly to the international market for Shakespearean recordings.

Throughout 1960, Caedmon steadily amassed an inventory of raw recordings, which were first released in December of that year. First off the record press were productions of *Macbeth, Othello* and *The Taming of the Shrew*. The very first of Caedmon's "ideal casts" featured actors who had already made a number of recordings for the label. The Caedmon *Macbeth* featured Anthony Quayle, Gwen Ffrangcon-Davies and Stanley Holloway. Caedmon's production entered in competition with an MRS production of the play as well as RCA-Victor's recording of a National Theatre of England production that starred Laurence Olivier. Perhaps because it was in competition with Columbia's earlier well-known recording of *Othello*, Caedmon's production of the play featured performances by American actor Frank Silvera and Caedmon regulars Cyril Cusack and Celia Johnson. Caedmon's *Othello* entered into competition with an MRS production as well as a Columbia production of the play. The third SRS production of *The Taming of the Shrew* featured a cast with a far more resolutely British disposition including Trevor Howard and Margaret Leighton—perhaps because Caedmon's version entered into competition with the Dublin Gate/Spoken Arts production.

Caedmon's productions of each play were based on authoritative unabridged texts as edited by noted Shakespearean authority G.B. Harrison. As such, they were effectively a reading program that supplemented the textual Shakespeare—as much or more than they were a supplement to the theatrical or performed Shakespeare. Ultimately, the SRS series represented a supplement to many separate performance traditions and media cultures. The majority of the cast members were classically trained British actors but British actors from other performance traditions, such as Stanley Holloway, or American actors were also used on occasion. In this way, then, these recordings represented a certain vocal hybridity.

Codes of theatrical performance were clearly affected by the technical translation of Shakespearean drama into the LP as a medium of secondary orality. As outlined by Harrison on the liner notes to *The Taming of the Shrew*:

> On the stage, the requirements of gesture, movement, voice projection and costume must be considered. But in this recording, the voice and its subtle

> inflections are paramount. The intimacy lost in projecting for a theatre is renewed. The poetry is evoked without jeopardizing the dramatic action.

In effect, techniques of primary theatrical declamation were adapted to conditions of conditions of secondary or technologized orality. In essence, Shakespeare was adapted for LP much as he was adapted for the visual spectacle of film—producing a secondary voice culture that was specific to the LP and very different from the theatrical tradition. Many of the early SRS recordings have a noticeably sibilant or whispered quality that mimicked intimate speech and simulated vocal proximity. However, for the most part Caedmon did not fetishize the spatial effects enabled by stereo—with the notable exception of *Macbeth* as one of the first plays recorded, which included sophisticated and eerie chorus-like vocal layering of the voices of the three witches.

In founding the SRS series, Caedmon was in a similar position as when it was founded in that Holdridge and Mantell would have to find a way of entrepreneurializing what was essentially an educational field of cultural production. With the collapse of projected Arts Council support in launching the MRS series in the U.S. under the Caedmon imprint, Holdridge and Mantell had to consider the question of how to launch a commercial series very carefully. One part of that equation was solved with the connections in Britain's theatrical performance community, which Caedmon was able to make through MCA London. Another involved the relationship that Caedmon developed with Leslie Gould, an Australian executive at the Netherlands-based Philips Records, whom Mantell met when he was passing through New York. As Mantell recalls: "Leslie Gould happened to be one of those guys who was interested in the theatre, interested in culture, interested in the kind of things that Caedmon was doing." As the result of these common interests as Mantell recalls: "Leslie said he would be our distributor in England" despite the fact at he "didn't think there would be a huge market for it [Caedmon product]" in England.

The Philips/Caedmon relationship was valuable for the income that was generated from Caedmon's licensing arrangement with Philips, which allowed it to sell Caedmon product in England much more effectively. However, much more important were the advantages that having a London-based studio afforded Caedmon. Through its association with Philips, Caedmon entered into the type of affiliation arrangement that its

American competitors enjoyed. As Mantell recalls: "They were helpful in enabling us to record. They provided the studio. We paid for it, but we didn't pay outsider rates." Without the technical and administrative support provided by Phillips, the ambitious recording schedule that was subsequently undertaken by Caedmon in England would never have been achieved. As Mantell notes: "They [Phillips] really made a lot of the practical parts of the English part of the recording—which was a major part of the Caedmon catalogue—possible."

Yet another part of the equation involved producing these theatrical records on a much more industrial scale. The *read text* and *spoken text* poetry recordings that had been the content of the monaural LP moment had been pressed in as few as 250 or 500 copies at a time. In contrast, stereo recordings were pressed in the thousands. This industrial scale production was enabled by Caedmon's method of marketing the SRS series on wholesale basis, which ultimately offset their much higher production costs. Caedmon adapted the principles of book-buying clubs for record-buying audiences, effectively eliminating the middleman or distributor and selling to customers directly. Consumers enjoyed a forty-percent discount off retail prices. Simultaneously, Caedmon increased its own profits. Much of success of the SRS series was due to these methods of marketing. By the mid-1960s, eight to ten people—or approximately one third of the total Caedmon staff—worked on club sales. These record-buying clubs became the engine that drove the Caedmon enterprise throughout the 1960s.

New methods of disseminating Caedmon product also began to evolve at this time. Radio had functioned to supplement Caedmon's penetration of book and record stores right from the beginning but with the development of the SRS series Caedmon entered into more formal relationships with some radio stations to actively sell Caedmon recordings. Essentially, Caedmon paid a select number of radio stations on a commission basis for each member of their audiences who joined one of Caedmon's wholesale record buying clubs. As Mantell recalls: "We had a deal with WBAI. They promoted a recording club or something. We paid them $5 per enquiry." Holdridge's records contain incomplete copies of some of these radio scripts, beginning with Radio Program #1, which involved the company's recording of *Macbeth*. These promotions involved interplay between each recorded Shakespearean play and the voice-over of a radio announcer who explained the action in a series of asides to radio audiences who were presumably unfamiliar with the themes of Shakespeare's works.[16]

A much more important shift in the distribution and dissemination of Caedmon recordings occurred when the record company terminated its association with Harper Brothers in 1961 and instead entered into an association with Houghton Mifflin. The Boston-based textbook publisher bought large amounts of Caedmon product at wholesale rates and shipped directly to its own customers. As a result of this arrangement, Houghton Mifflin was able to buy Caedmon inventory at a substantial discount. In return, Houghton Mifflin actively promoted Caedmon records in bookstores as well as undertaking promotional campaigns directed at educational markets. Caedmon benefited from this arrangement in several ways. One of these was the fact that Houghton Mifflin enjoyed a good relationship with the Department of Education. As a result, Caedmon product was much more fully integrated into the formal educational system.

Popular audiences remained important, however. The audiences for the SRS series appear to have been relatively heterogeneous. Although they clearly included teachers, they also included housewives and petroleum engineers or, as Mantell phrases it, "people who did what they did for a living because that was the job that they happened to end up with." As Mantell elaborates upon the demographics of the SRS audience: "Some people go to school and are forced to read a Shakespeare play. They may enjoy it or they may not . . . . They are forced to take a history of English course, and some really enjoy it, but they have no opportunity, or it does not occur to them, to go to graduate school. They go get a job. They get a job as a secretary or a bus driver or whatever job is available depending on where they live and what the economic conditions are. That doesn't mean that if the opportunity presents itself, if there is a Shakespeare production . . . . They *go*. They *want* to go." As framed by Mantell, Caedmon's theatrical recordings were merely supplements for live performance and a college education rather than replacements for both.[17]

The production of the SRS series accelerated in 1961. Caedmon's strategy appears to have been to release productions of plays that had already been recorded by others. First off the record press was a production of *The Winter's Tale* that starred John Gielgud and Peggy Ashcroft as directed by Peter Wood. Caedmon's production entered into competition with a MRS version that was available on the London label. That recording was followed by Sackler's production of *Romeo and Juliet*, which starred Albert Finney and Claire Bloom. The album entered into competition with four other recordings including a MRS production and a Spoken Word Dublin Gate Theatre production. The next two SRS releases were a Wood-directed production of *Measure for Measure* that starred John Gielgud, Ralph Richardson and Margaret Leighton and a Sackler-directed production of *Twelfth Night* that starred Siobahn McKenna and Paul Scofield. The former entered into direct competition with a MRS recording, the latter with a production that had been recorded by the Spoken Word label. Sackler also directed a recording of Richard Burton and Edith Evans readings all the non-dramatic verse attributed to Shakespeare, entitled *The Rape of Lucrece and Other Poems.*

The SRS series continued to form a prominent part of the new recordings that Caedmon released in 1962 and 1963. Wood directed two plays for the series in 1962, including a performance of *As You Like It* that starred Vanessa Redgrave, Max Adrian and Stanley Holloway, and a production of *Richard II* that featured John Gielgud. Both entered into competition with MRS recordings; the former also competed against a Dublin Gate version. Sackler also directed several plays in the SRS series in 1962 including a production of *Coriolanus* that starred Richard Burton and Jessica Tandy and a production of *Troilus and Cressida* that featured performances by Jeremy Brett, Cyril Cusack and Max Adrian. Productions of both plays were available as part of the MRS series. Caedmon released five new records in the SRS series in 1963, all of which were directed by Sackler. First of the record press was a production of *Cymbeline* that starred Boris Karloff as supported by Claire Bloom and Pamela Brown. It was followed by a production of *Anthony and Cleopatra* that starred Anthony Quayle and Pamela Brown and entered into competition with a MRS recording. Next off the press was Sackler's production of *Much Ado About Nothing*, which starred Rex Harrison and Rachel Roberts. This recording entered into competition with MRS and Dublin Gate Theatre productions. Caedmon's *Hamlet* and *Julius Caesar* followed. The former starred Paul Scofield and entered into competition with an RCA/Victor version starring John Gielgud as well as three other versions including one that was part of the MRS series. Caedmon's *Julius Caesar* starred Ralph Richardson, Anthony Quayle and Alan Bates and entered into competition with a MRS recording as well as two different Dublin Gate Theatre productions that were available on the Spoken Arts and Spoken Word labels.

The SRS series remained the engine behind the Caedmon enterprise in 1964. Five SRS recordings were released that year, all of which were directed by Sackler. A production of *King John* that starred Rosemary Harris and Donald Wolfit was the first off the press; next was a full-length production of *The Merchant of Venice* that starred Dorothy Tutin and Harry Andrews. Caedmon also published a recording of *The Tempest* that starred Michael and Vanessa Redgrave and a recording of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* that starred Paul Scofield and Joy Parker. Finally, it mounted a production of *Henry IV Part One* with a cast that included Anthony Quayle, Michael Redgrave and Pamela Brown (*Part Two* was released the following year.) Caedmon also released a recording of Shakespeare's early works *Venus and Adonis* and *A Lover's Complaint* as performed by Claire Bloom and Max Adrian.

Another 1964 recording involved John Gielgud's recital of Shakespeare's sonnets. The latter was particularly important given Gielgud's status as one of actor-directors at the center of the mid-century Shakespeare revival. Gielgud had achieved much popularity in America as the result *Ages of Man*, his one-man recital of soliloquies from Shakespeare, which had also been released on LP by Columbia and Caedmon had wanted the opportunity to record Gielgud for a considerable period of time. One morning, Mantell unexpectedly received a phone call informing her that Gielgud—who was on tour with *Ages of Man* in Philadelphia—would be available for two hours that afternoon. Mantell, who lived in Princeton, had two young children at the time. She scrambled to book time in a Philadelphia sound recording studio and promptly headed to that city with one of her young sons in tow. Once there, she soon faced an obstacle. The studio she had rented was next door to a construction site. Ten minutes before Gielgud's scheduled arrival, she recalls: "A jackhammer begins—and the Philadelphia Electric Company starts to dig." Mantell solved that particular problem by impersonating an official from the mayor's office over the telephone in order to persuade the utility to cease for a few hours. Gielgud showed up shortly afterwards and the recording session went smoothly. As Mantell notes: "Gielgud is the only actor to whom you could hand Shakespeare's sonnets and say, 'Please read them.'"

However, in his memoir Gielgud remembered the events surrounding this recording session slightly differently. Although the liner notes reveal that the actor was recorded on several different occasions on two different continents, Gielgud recalled his Caedmon recording purely in terms with his connection with Sackler and omitted an account of this session with Mantell (104). Clearly, many aspects of the Caedmon enterprise would not have succeeded without the services of Sackler. Many actors simply would have refused to take direction from a woman. However, Sackler was beginning to diversify his professional interests. He directed an NBC television documentary entitled *Shakespeare: Soul of an Age* in 1964 that starred Michael Redgrave and Ralph Richardson. According to Mantell, he also worked as a sub-director for Stanley Kubrick but later had his name removed from the credits in a dispute over "creative differences."

Theatrical recording projects dominated the Caedmon catalogue from 1960 forward. While very few *read text* literary recordings were released after that time, the label continued to publish *spoken text* recordings. In 1960, Caedmon released a recording of Pamela Brown performing D.H. Lawrence's *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. It also released a recording of Julie Harris reading the letters and poetry of Emily Dickinson. A recording of Basil Rathbone reading the poetry of Poe and another of the actor reading two short stories by Hawthorne was also released, as was a dramatic recording of reading Dickens' *A Christmas Carol* featuring performances by Ralph Richardson, Paul Scofield and a dozen other actors. Finally, the label added another in its series in recordings of *The Canterbury Tales* with Peggy Ashcroft's reading of "The Wife of Bath's Tale." Caedmon also returned to the figure of James Joyce the following year with the release of a recording of Cyril Cusack reading excerpts from *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. The label also released recording of the medieval romance *Tristan and Iseult* as translated by Hilaire Belloc and performed by Claire Bloom. Ralph Richardson made another *spoken text* recording of the poetry of William Blake.

Recordings of historical British poetry remained the mainstay in the Caedmon *spoken text* catalogue in 1962. Many of the actors who made these were also associated with the SRS series. Richard Burton made two such recordings—one of the poetry of Thomas Hardy and another of the metaphysical love poetry of John Donne. Another SRS regular, Paul Scofield, also made a recording of the poetry of John Dryden. The fourth and final performance by a SRS actor involved Michaél MacLiammóir's reading of excerpts from Spenser's *The Fairie Queene* and *Epithalamion.* Caedmon also augmented its series of *spoken text* recordings of modern and medieval literature in 1962. It published a recording of *The General Prologue* and *The Prologue to the Parson's Tale* as performed by Toronto academic J.B. Bessinger, who also performed selections from Old English poetry on a second record that he made for the label that year, including his performance of excerpts from *Beowulf* and *Caedmon's Hymn.* At the other end of the historical spectrum, Caedmon released also *spoken text* recording of short story stylist Katherine Mansfield as performed by Celia Johnson. In 1963, Caedmon released yet another recording of Ralph Richardson reading the verse of Alexander Pope. It also augmented its series of recordings of Chaucer's *The Canterbury Tales* with recordings of "The Miller's Tale" and "The Pardoner's Tale" as performed my Michaél MacLiammóir and Stanley Holloway. Finally, it released a recording of ballads about Robin Hood as sung by Anthony Quayle.

Even as the anglophile disposition of the Caedmon catalogue generally reflected the ongoing project of articulating American and British literature, the *spoken text* catalogue simultaneously reflected the dialectic between American and cosmopolitan recordings. Typical of the disposition of the Caedmon catalogue at this juncture was a 1962 *spoken text* album entitled *Great American Poetry*, which featured performances by Vincent Price, Julie Harris, Eddie Albert, Helen Gahagan Douglas and Ed Begley. *Great American Poetry* contained both canonic and popular American literature, effectively functioning as a midcult mechanism that collapsed the high/low culture divide. (The album was also representative of the larger field of patriotic recordings as published by labels such as Capital and Lexington.). Caedmon also continued to release recordings of cosmopolitan world literature. The following year, Caedmon released a *spoken text* recording of Cyril Cusack performing selections from Samuel Beckett's trilogy *Molloy, Malone Dies and The Unnamable*; it also made a German-language recording of actress Lotte Lenya reading selected stories of Franz Kafka.

The dialectic between American and cosmopolitan *spoken text* recordings was prominent throughout the mid and late sixties. Reflecting the cosmopolitan disposition of the catalogue and wider dynamics within the sub-field of spoken word recording was a

1964 French-language anthology of French poetry, which was likely designed to compete with the Spoken Arts French language poetry anthology that had been published several years earlier. Much more typical of the disposition of the Caedmon catalogue at this juncture was Ed Begley's second *spoken text* performance of the poetry of Walt Whitman. *Vol. 1, Leaves of Grass* had been released in 1957 and involved Begley's performance of "I Hear America Singing" along with several excerpts from "Song of Myself." *Volume 2* featured Begley's performance of "Song of the Open Road," "When Lilac's Last in the Dooryard Bloom'd" and more excerpts from "Song of Myself." Begley was recorded so often reading American literature that he effectively became the *spoken text* analogue to Carl Sandburg as the *read text* "voice of America." The radio actor's recordings of historical American literature and of Whitman in particular are effectively at the scene of the postmodern in that they perform the ideological centering of that poet's work—flattening Whitman's complex prosody into "radio voice" as a regime of secondary orality. These recordings, then, are effectively part of the wider ideological recuperation of Whitman.

However, in general *spoken text* recordings of prose works were becoming much more prominent in the catalogue at this juncture. Caedmon produced a recording of two of P.G. Wodehouse's Jeeves stories that year; it also released the first in its series of recordings of Sherlock Holmes stories, as read by Basil Rathbone. Sackler also directed production of Roark Bradford's now-controversial collection of short stories, *Ol' Man Adam and His Chillun,* featuring an African-American cast. Rounding out the company's *spoken text* recordings of popular American literature was a patriotic recording of Edward G. Robinson reading Edward Hale's *The Man Without a Country.* Significantly, Caedmon augmented its emphasis on popular American and British fiction that year to include an album of the stories of Sholem Aleichem, as translated into English and performed by Menasha Skulnik.

The catalogue also continuously diversified in ways that reflected Caedmon's competition with other record companies. Reflecting its competition with the MRS series, many SRS recordings also included musical orchestration; music was also a part of many of Caedmon's medieval spoken word recordings. With the introduction of the musical element, Caedmon entered into competition with music-orientated record labels that occasionally produced spoken word records, and most notably with Folkways. The competition between Folkways became more overt when Caedmon launched its own series of amateur British folk recordings. These involved the commercial publication of Allan Lomax and Peter Kennedy's 1950 project to record the living folk tradition of Great Britain, as part of an examination of the impact of that tradition on American folk music. Caedmon published the first in the series in 1963 and continued to publish these under the title *Folksongs of Britain.* Each album involved a particular theme such as *Songs of Courtship, Songs of Seduction, Jack of All Trades, Serving Men and Serving Maids* or *A Soldier's Life.* Caedmon's representation of this essentially ethnological material was somewhat ambivalent, however. In particular, the album covers were openly satirical. In Bourdieu's terms, then, even as Caedmon occupied a similar "position" to Folkways with the production of these series, its "position-taking" was radically different.

While dramatic recordings remained the engine that drove the larger Caedmon enterprise, in 1961 Caedmon began to supplement the SRS dramatic series in ways that reflected on the increasingly international disposition of the Caedmon catalogue. It released a modern Greek-language recording of adaptations of the works of Euripedes, Sophocles and Aeschylus as revisioned by contemporary Greek playwrights Katina Paxinou and Alexis Minotis. Caedmon also published a French-language recording of Voltaire's *Candide* that featured performances by Robert Franc, Lilyan Chauvin and Sylvane Lourie. Reflecting its ongoing interest in Jean Cocteau, the label also released an English-language production of Cocteau's *The Human Voice* that starred Ingrid Bergman. Caedmon returned to its project to record plays outside the Shakespearean canon in 1964. The first of these projects involved a production of Alexandre Dumas' *Camille,* which was directed by and starred Eve Le Gallienne. Also released was Sackler's production of Sheridan's *The Rivals* featuring Edith Evans, Pamela Brown, Michaél MacLiammóir, Vanessa Redgrave and Alan Bates.

These abridged recordings were part of the regular catalogue. However, late in 1964 the company signaled a new direction with the launching of the Theatrical Recording Society series, which featured unabridged productions of classical, modern and contemporary plays. Fittingly, the TRS series was launched with a Sackler-directed production of Tennessee Williams' *The Glass Menagerie* that starred Montgomery Clift, Jessica Tandy and Julie Harris. A production of *Medea* was released around the same time. These two recordings revealed the continuing dialectic between American and cosmopolitan and/or classical theatrical traditions as supplements to the SRS series. Essentially, the TRS series enabled a turn to American drama as a supplement to Shakespeare as the content of the "stereo moment." Initially, the TRS series consolidated around the figure of Tennessee Williams. Later, the plays of Arthur Miller—and in the post-acquisition period those of Eugene O'Neill—would become central.

An important exception to this dual emphasis on theatrical and *spoken text* recordings was the documentary recording *John F. Kennedy: A Self-Portrait*. Mantell, whose husband Harold enjoyed close ties to the highest echelons of the Democratic Party, was invited to produce the documentary immediately after the President's assassination. She was given exclusive access to NBC's archive of recordings of the President's speeches and spent seven weeks splicing these together in order to produce the two-disc documentary. The recording followed the President's career chronologically beginning with Kennedy's announcement—in a press conference held with Carl Sandburg—of his intention to run for the presidency, and ending with the last speech he gave at Fort Worth, Texas. Also included were Kennedy's first and last State of the Union addresses and key speeches that he had made throughout his Presidency.[18] Mantell considers this voice document to be one of her own key achievements at Caedmon not only for the technical skill with which she blended different speeches but also for her editorial choices in the material to be included. The sound recording represented one of Caedmon's rare attempts to use the LP in the service of a documentary or truth-telling genre. At the same time, the record reflected a broader turn to speeches or political rhetoric as a secondary spoken word performance genre.

Theatrical recordings remained central throughout 1965. Sackler directed three SRS productions that year including a production of *King Lear* that starred Paul Scofield and Rachel Roberts. He also directed a production of *All's Well that Ends Well* that starred Claire Bloom, Eric Portman and Lynn Redgrave and a production of *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* that starred Peter Wyngarde and Edward deSouza. Three productions were added to the TRS series in 1965. Sackler directed a production of

Cyrano de Bergerac that starred Ralph Richardson and Anna Massey; Wood directed a production of Ibsen's *The Master Builder* that starred Michael Redgrave and Maggie Smith; Anthony Quayle also directed a production of George Bernard Shaw's *Caesar and Cleopatra* that starred Claire Bloom and Max Adrian. Theatrical recordings remained at the heart of the Caedmon enterprise throughout 1966. However, only one SRS recording was released that year—a Sackler-directed production of *The Merry Wives of Windsor* that starred Anthony Quayle, Michaél MacLiammóir and Joyce Redman. In contrast, Caedmon released eight recordings in the TRS series in 1965. These included a Sackler-directed production of Goldsmith's *She Stoops to Conquer* starring Claire Bloom and Alistair Sim and a production of George Bernard Shaw's *St. Joan* starring Siobahn McKenna and Donald Pleasence. A recording of five of W.B. Yeats' one-act plays starring Cyril Cusack and Patrick Magee was also released, as was a production of T.S. Eliot's *The Family Reunion* that starred Paul Scofield and Sybil Thorndike. An emphasis on American works was signaled in 1966 by a production of Arthur Miller's *Death of a Salesman*; the production starred Lee J. Cobb, Mildred Dunnock, Gene Williams—and an unknown Dustin Hoffman. Caedmon also released a production of Anton Chekhov's *The Cherry Orchard* that year.

These dramatic recordings were popular commodities but their production was also seemingly tied to the cultural politics of the Cold War and the politicization of theater during this period. While Chekhov clearly deserved inclusion in Caedmon's canon of modern drama, for example, the use of his name was a particularly prominent sign in the cultural politics of the Cold War. Most notably, the Ford Foundation funded an organ called Chekhov Publishing House that was dedicated to publishing not only the works of Chekhov as a pre-revolutionary Russian writer but also to Russian translations of Western literary classics and Russian editions of proscribed Russian literary works—all of which were disseminated within the USSR.[19] Miller was also a sign in the cultural Cold War not only for his thinly veiled critique of McCarthyism in *The Crucible* but also because his had been a lone voice condemning the politicization of culture by the CCF.[20] Thus, while the decision to release productions of Chekhov's and Miller's plays clearly reflected the editorial taste and judgment of Caedmon's founders, those decisions were seemingly also haunted by semiotics of CCF "discourse."

However, the major TRS record to be released in 1966 was a Wood-directed production of Peter Weiss' *The Persecution and Assassination of Jean-Paul Marat as Performed by the Inmates of the Asylum of Charneton Under the Direction of the Marquis de Sade*. Weiss' play featured a cast of thirty-five including Ralph Richardson and Glenda Jackson. The play had been a hit in London but Caedmon was able to make its recording in New York when a production of the play was mounted in that city. The project was extremely unusual for Caedmon in that it represented the recording of a contemporary rather than a well-consecrated or canonic play. This decision seems to have involved an instance of the mediation of dissent and the politics of cultural containment. As Caedmon's director Wood noted, the play provoked what he termed "an alert political response" in its own political moment in that seemed to be tied to the protest that was then stirring about the deteriorating situation in Vietnam.[21]

While the production of the play was symbolically important, it was materially difficult to produce. In general, theatrical recordings that were undertaken in New York were fraught by difficulties that British recordings did not entail. One of these involved what Holdridge and Mantell saw as the "intractability" of the powerful unions that represented actors and musicians in that city. This was at issue in the company's recording of *Marat/de Sade* because Mantell, who thought the British orchestra to be superior to that used in the Broadway production, imported the former to New York for the purposes of making its sound recording. Predictably, the AMF shut Caedmon down. Mantell solved the problem by using British musicians but paying AMF musicians for the recording session, including at overtime rates, even though they sat idle throughout it.

The company published eleven theatrical recordings in 1967. Two were part of the SRS series—a recording of *Richard III* that starred Robert Stephens, Peggy Ashcroft and Michael York, and a production of *Titus Andronicus* that starred Anthony Quayle and Judi Dench, both of which were directed by Sackler. Caedmon also continued to diversify the offerings in the TRS series by releasing two recordings of classical drama: the first of these involved a production of *Antigone* that starred Dorothy Tutin and Max Adrian; the second involved a production of Aristophanes' *Lyistrata* that starred Hermione Gingold and Stanley Holloway. Sackler directed both. Wood directed a production of Milton's *Samson Agonistes* that starred Michael Redgrave and Max Adrian that year, while John Gielgud directed a production of Sheridan's *School for Scandal* that starred Ralph Richardson and Gwen Ffrangçon Davies.

"Touchstones" of modern drama were particularly prominent in the TRS recordings that were released in 1967. Caedmon released a production of Chekhov's *Uncle Vanya* that year, which like Caedmon's earlier production of *The Cherry Orchard* is no longer listed in the Caedmon catalogue and Sackler's production of Ibsen's *Hedda Gabler,* which starred Joan Plowright, Anthony Quayle and Patrick Magee. These modern classics were supplemented by cosmopolitan productions of contemporary experimental drama in the form of a production of Genet's *The Balcony* that starred Pamela Brown, Patrick Magee and Cyril Cusack, and a production of Eugene Ionesco's *The Chairs* that starred Cusack, Siobahnn McKenna and Ionesco himself. The label also returned to American drama that year with a production of Tennessee Williams' *The Rose Tattoo* that starred Maureen Stapleton and Christopher Walken. Also released was a production of Arthur Miller's *View from the Bridge* that is no longer listed in the catalogue.

The Caedmon *spoken text* catalogue also continued to articulate British and American culture. In 1965, the label added to its series of interview recordings with *Five British Sculptors Talk,* which featured discussions with Henry Moore and other British sculptors. Caedmon also released *Churchill in His Own Voice* as a documentary recording featuring selections from Churchill's recorded speeches. Archival recordings of the voices of Churchill's contemporaries including Neville Chamberlain, King George VI, Eleanor Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, and Dwight Eisenhower were also included. These were supplemented by actors' *spoken text* performances of excerpts from Churchill's memoirs as performed by John Gielgud, Laurence Olivier and George Patten. This recording represented the larger memorialization of the war in the Caedmon catalogue as well as a turn to rhetoric or recordings of speeches. Other recordings released in 1965 included *The White House Saga*, a documentary that entailed a history of the American presidency as narrated by Ed Begley. The actor also read the first volume of a series that was directed towards the young children's market entitled *Tall Tales*. Caedmon also released another in its series of stories of Rudyard Kipling as performed by

Boris Karloff and two recordings of Basil Rathbone reading the stories of Edgar Allan Poe and Nathaniel Hawthorne's *The Scarlet Letter*.

The following year, Ed Begley performed on two *spoken text* anthologies entitled *American Poetry: Favorite Poems* and *Poems of Patriotism*. Begley also made recordings of excerpts of *Tom Sawyer* and *Huckleberry Finn*. At the same time, Caedmon continued to translate the British textual tradition into *spoken text* recordings of historical poetry; it released a recording of James Mason reading the poetry of A.E. Houseman and another recording of the actor reading the verse of Browning. Caedmon also added to its line of *spoken text* recordings with another of the Sherlock Holmes stories as performed by Basil Rathbone. By the mid-sixties, these *spoken text* records had completely displaced the *read texts* upon which the company had been founded. The recording of canonic and popular historical literature resulted in a stripping of aura in that a relatively few number of actors such as Mason, Rathbone and Begley performed these texts.

However, Caedmon also published a superlative *spoken text* recording of Edgar Lee Masters' free verse epic *Spoon River Anthology* in 1965. Dr. X. E. Dance of the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Speech Communication Center directed the recording, which featured fifty-six Midwesterners—including two farmer's wives, a barber, a stockbroker and a minister—reading works from Masters' popular free verse anthology. In making this recording, Caedmon was turning to the tradition of popular free verse, against which the modernists had revolted. In this sense, the label was recovering the popular disposition of the original free verse of the Chicago school, whose members included Masters, Lindsay and Sandburg. Caedmon also released a *spoken text* recording of Tennessee Williams reading the poetry of Hart Crane the following year. It is clear from the liner notes, which were written by Williams himself, that he chose to do so as a surrogate for Crane who tragically took his own life in 1932 at the age of thirty-three.

Spoken text historical recordings released in 1967 included excerpts from Homer's *Iliad* as performed by Anthony Quayle. Two of Chaucer's *The Canterbury Tales* were added to the catalogue: J.B. Bessinger's performances of "The Reeves Tale" and "The Miller's Tale." Caedmon added another in Rathbone's performances of the stories of Sherlock Holmes and several children's recordings, including Karloff's performance of *Aesop's Fables* and two more in his series of performances of the works of Rudyard Kipling. The label released recordings of Jack London's *Call of the Wild* and another recording of excerpts from Tom Sawyer's *Huckleberry Finn* as read by Begley. James Mason also performed a dramatic *spoken text* recording of James Fenimore Cooper's *The Last of the Mohicans*. In general, *spoken text* recordings of popular American historical fiction were becoming increasingly prominent at this juncture.[22]

However, the articulation of a postmodern "global" culture was also reflected in the composition of Caedmon's line of *spoken text* recordings in 1967. Two recordings of historical Canadian writers who were relatively unknown in the United States—poet Robert Service and short story writer Ernest Thompson Seton—were also released in 1967. (Begley read the works of both.) Caedmon also added an internationally-oriented record that was entitled *Great Short Stories* that featured Claire Bloom and Cyril Cusack performing stories by Saki, Somerset Maugham, William Saroyan and Liam O'Flaherty; it also released two French-language recordings that were intended for children's market, *Roman de la Rénard* and *Comtes de Perreault, d'Anderson, et de Grimm*. Clearly, the catalogue had become almost purely kitsch at this point; popular or trade sales of Caedmon recordings began to decline rapidly the following year.

However, since 1965 Caedmon had been focusing on recordings specifically for the educational market. The fourth and final phase of the Caedmon enterprise was driven by federal funding initiatives to introduce audio and audio-visual materials into American classrooms of such a scale that they were referred to by publishers in the audio and a-v field as "the Uncle Sam Sweepstakes." Holdridge remembers that Caedmon became affluent for the first time only in the 1960s "when the federal funding came for the schools." As she recalls: "They were hungry for the software as it's called. They had the hardware—they were given the hardware—and they had to get something to play on it. So we would get frantic phone calls—'Our year ends in thirty days. Send us $10,000 worth of recordings!" From Holdridge's perspective, Caedmon earned these profits given the lean years that she and Mantell had spent in the early and mid 1950s. As she recalls of the Title I and Title II funding that Caedmon enjoyed from 1964 onward: "It was wonderful! But we earned that. We went through such lean periods in the fifties."

While enormously profitable in the short-term, these initiatives resulted in the penetration of the field of educational recording by large-scale industrial capital—resulting in considerably more competition and finally the saturation of the field.

However, the most immediate impact of these federal funding initiatives was the development of materials specifically for the grade school market. This shift involved the production of new types of spoken text recordings suitable for younger ages, in combination with the harvesting or coupling Caedmon's archive of *read* and *spoken text* recordings. The four-record album *American Literature,* which was developed in association with textbook publisher Houghton Mifflin, was one the first in a series of large-scale educational recordings. It was produced in 1965 as an audio companion to the printed anthology of the same name that was edited by Mark Shorer and Mark Van Doren and published by Houghton Mifflin same year. Van Doren also provided spoken interpretative commentary on the audio companion album. The four-disc *American Literature* album represented the first of a seventeen-disc educational series that Caedmon developed in partnership with Houghton Mifflin.

The disposition of these materials was very different from those that Caedmon had marketed to popular or trade and educational markets; most essentially it involved an interpolation of many different genres of sound recordings. *American Literature* interspersed T.S. Eliot's performance with of "The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock" with readings by Frost and Sandburg as two relatively popular poets who read "The Death of the Hired Hand" and "Prayers of Steel" among other selections, for example. These *read text* performances were interpolated with *spoken text* performances including actor David Wayne's performance of Ogden Nash's poem "Kindly Unhitch That Star, Buddy," Basil Rathbone's reading of Poe's "Annabel Lee" and Ed Begley's performance of excerpts of Whitman's "Song of Myself." These literary selections were interpolated with examples of democratic political rhetoric, including Hume Cronyn's *spoken text* reading of Jefferson's "The Declaration of Independence" and Hal Holbrook's reading of Lincoln's "The Gettysburg Address." Effectively, then, the anthology articulated American canonic literature—and Eliot as the archetypal example of second face of Modernism in particular—with American popular literature. It also interpolated the field of *read* and *spoken text* poetry recording with democratic political rhetoric as a form of ideological inscription.

These educational materials were also directed towards increasingly younger audiences. In 1967, Caedmon published two *spoken text* poetry anthologies that were to be used in the context of elementary education. *Poems for Children* was directed towards children in the second and third grades and included selections from the works of Christopher Marlowe, Emily Dickinson, Christina Rosetti, Walter de la Mare, Carl Sandburg, and Gwendolyn Brooks as well as more popular poets such as Eve Merrian. Essentially, the anthology interpolated monuments of the Anglo-American poetry "canon" with the tradition of popular poetry written for children. *Poetry for Children* was produced for the fourth, fifth, and sixth grades and featured selections for the works of many of the poets who were included in the anthology for earlier grades while adding more difficult works by William Blake and Gerald Manley Hopkins among others. *Spoken text* works by several of the literary modernists were prominently featured, including W.B. Yeats' "The Lake Isle of Innisfree" and W.C. Williams' "Lighthearted William;" *spoken text* readings of works by contemporary poets such as Kenneth Patchen, Theodore Roethke and Galway Kinnell were also featured.

Another slightly different anthology, *Meditations for Modern Classrooms,* was published around the same time. It featured Ed Begley and Judith Anderson reading foundational acts of American presidential rhetoric along with excerpts from literary and philosophical works. Philosophical selections included Marcus Aurelius' "Meditations of Work," Virgil's "Not Every Field is Clothed with Grass," Lao-Tse's "The Leader" and Ralph Waldo Emerson's "Self-Reliance." Examples of political rhetoric included Jefferson's "Declaration of Independence," Abraham Lincoln's "The Gettysburg Address" and Teddy Roosevelt's "The Doer of Deeds." Selections from literary works included Walt Whitman's "I Hear America Singing" and a performance of Langston Hughes's "In Time of Silver Rain." Fundamentally, this document articulated American and Western civilization as well as political rhetoric and modern poetry.

Caedmon also continued to develop new materials for its college audiences, however. Throughout 1966, Caedmon entered into discussion with the publishers of popular print anthologies with a view to producing a companion audio anthology to a major print anthology for either Cleanth Brooks' and Robert Penn Warren's *Understanding Poetry* and Laurence Perrine's *Sound and Sense.* Discussions with the latter seem to have been the most extensive. In a January 21 1966 letter to William A. Pullin of Harcourt Brace, Perrine himself outlined exactly what selections of poetry should be included and the exigencies of who should read these selections. Poets that Perrine specifically recommended for inclusion were Robert Frost, Richard Wilbur, Archibald MacLeish, E.E. Cummings, Dylan Thomas, T.S. Eliot, Theodore Spencer, James Stephens, Robert Graves, "Theodore Roethky" [sic] and John Crowe Ransome. Unfortunately, Caedmon had not recorded many of the specific poems recommended by Perrine and because others held the copyright to these performances, which made this commercial project somewhat unfeasible.

The disposition of the Caedmon catalogue was substantially different from that of the educational anthologists. With the exception of Theodore Roethke, none of the poets that Perrine recommended for inclusion were ethnic minorities and none were women. The disposition of recordings of poetry published by the spoken word recording industry was comparatively liberal as compared to the politics of excision practiced by the print anthologists during the same period. Clearly, the disposition of the *read text* Caedmon catalogue as shaped during the pre-*Treasury* period corresponded much more closely to the international "face" of American modernism. This would seem to indicate that the two were in fact separate fields of ideological production. While clearly anglophile in disposition, the Caedmon catalogue was not structured around the larger masculinization of modernism, in particular. Indeed, it is unlikely that the voices of female poets would have been included in the commercial spoken word archive of the masculinist postwar period without the efforts of Caedmon.

Caedmon continued to publish familiar sound recordings genres throughout 1968 and 1969. However, clearly the "SRS moment" was waning. A Sackler-directed production of *The Comedy of Errors* that starred Alec McCowen and Anna Massey was the only SRS recording published in 1968. In contrast, eight recordings were released in the TRS series. Caedmon returned to Chekhov with a production entitled *Three Suites* that is no longer listed in the catalogue. It also published a production of Wilde's *The Importance of Being Earnest* that starred Alec McCowen. Caedmon returned to Cocteau with a Sackler-directed production of *The Infernal Machine* that starred Margaret Leighton and Jeremy Brett. Sackler directed a production of T.S. Eliot's *Murder in the Cathedral* that starred Paul Scofield, Cyril Cusack, Patrick Magee and Glenda Jackson, and a production of Jean-Paul Sartre's *No Exit* that starred Jackson, Donald Pleasence and Anna Massey. Rounding out the TRS series were productions of two Arthur Miller plays that are no longer available on the Caedmon label, *Incident at Vichy* and *After the Fall* as the third and fourth productions of works by that playwright in four years.

Caedmon released only one *spoken text* recording of historical poetry in 1968—a record that featured Julie Harris performing the works of Emily Dickinson. Seemingly in the spirit of mediating dissent of supporting MacLeish's opposition to the war in Vietnam the label released a *spoken text* performance of Henry David Thoreau's *Civil Disobedience*. It also published a new kind of spoken word record that interpolated an author's *read text* performance in the form of excerpts from Dos Passos' *The 42nd Parallel* as drawn from archival recordings with *spoken text* performance of the same work by actors Rip Torn and Ed Begley. The latter also added to his series of *spoken text* recordings of popular literature with a performance of the Rip Van Winkle story. The company also published two *spoken text* performances by Basil Rathbone, including another of the actor's performances of the Sherlock Holmes' stories and his dramatic performance of George Eliot's *Silas Marner*. The final *spoken text* recording to be released in 1968 involved Ossie Davis' performance of Langston Hughes' collection of Simple stories.

Company correspondence indicates that Holdridge appears to have pursued the project of recording Hughes himself. In a letter to Holdridge dated March 20 1965, the author affirmed: "I would, of course, be delighted to have something of mine recorded by Caedmon." Hughes went on to elaborate several different possibilities regarding recording projects, which ranged from a recording of himself reading his poetry to a *spoken text* performance of *The Sweet Wallpaper of Life* which Hughes suggested might be read by Ethel Waters or Pearl Bailey. Despite a repeated series of contacts, Caedmon did not record Hughes before he died. It is uncertain why it did not do so. In addition to the requirement for consensus between Caedmon's two founders regarding issue of "long term editorial judgement," there was also the question of exigencies of the market for educational recordings.[23] Were the label to have recorded him, Hughes would have been the first African-American writer to be included in the Caedmon catalogue. Instead, that honor went to Gwendolyn Brooks whose Caedmon LP was released in 1969.

Caedmon continued to produce familiar genres of spoken word documents and to market these in ways that had worked in the past. Only one SRS recording was released in 1969—a Sackler-directed production of *Pericles* that starred Paul Scofield and Judi Dench. In contrast, five recordings in the TRS series were released. Sackler directed a recording of John Webster's *The Duchess of Malfi* that starred Barbara Jefford and Jeremy Brett. However, these were the last recordings to be directed by Sackler. Holdridge and Mantell recall that that their break with Sackler arose suddenly when he refused to comp them tickets to *The Great White Hope*, his Broadway hit play which later won a Pulitzer Prize. Sackler had been part of Caedmon since the beginning and was essential to the company's commercial success. He worked closely with the British film and stage actors who were so necessary to the SRS and TRS series. So intrinsic was Sackler to Caedmon's success that he had been paid an annual salary that averaged $70,000—a sum that exceeded that drawn by Holdridge and Mantell. While Sackler went on to achieve success in Hollywood, most notably as the screenwriter for *Jaws,* his departure from Caedmon signaled the end of an era. Without his participation, the SRS series ground to halt and the disposition of the TRS series changed dramatically.

Caedmon published four TRS recordings in 1969, however. Val Gielgud directed a production of George Bernard Shaw's *Heartbreak House* that starred Jessica Tandy. Caedmon also produced two productions of Moliere's *Tartuffe* and *The Misanthrope,* both of which were translated by Richard Wilbur. Jean Gascon directed the former production, which starred William Hutt and Martha Henry; the latter starred Richard Easton and Sydney Walker and was directed by Stephen Porter. The final entry in the TRS series involved a production of *A Moon for the Misbegotten*, which was directed by Theodore Mann and which starred Salome Jens and Michael Ryan.

Caedmon published no *read text* recordings in 1969 and even the label's *spoken text* recordings were much reduced in scope. Ed Begley was recorded on *Walt Whitman: Crossing Brooklyn Ferry and Other Poems* and *Walt Whitman: Eyewitness to the Civil War*; he also performed on a recording of excerpts of Twain's *Life Along the Mississippi.*

Anthony Quayle made a number of *spoken text* recordings for the label, including a recording of the poetry of John Milton, a recording devoted to excerpts of Richard Lattimore's translation of Homer's *The Odyssey,* and a recording about classical Greek mythology entitled *The Twelve Labours of Hercules.*[24] These *spoken text* records were augmented by Kemp Malone's performance of his translations of Beowulf and Chaucer and by MacLeish's performance of Henry David Thoreau's *Walden.* Coming full circle, Caedmon—seemingly inexplicably—released a documentary recording about the life of President Dwight D. Eisenhower. This recording represented a certain culmination of America's Cold War cultural crusade, which had arguably haunted the Caedmon enterprise from the very beginning.

The only departure from the well-established formula involved the increasing importance of so-called Black Studies materials as a new genre in the field of educational recordings. That genre expanded exponentially in the middle and late 1960s as an institutional response to the Civil Rights movement and Caedmon, like other publishers of spoken word recordings, attempted to cater to the new market. The label returned to the figure of Langston Hughes in 1969 with the release of an LP devoted to his poetry as read by Ossie Davis and Ruby Dee. It also released the documentary *Black Pioneers in American History, Volume I 19th Century* and a *spoken text* LP consisting of selections from the autobiographies of Frederick Douglass, Charlotte L. Forten, Susan King Taylor and Nat Love, as performed by Moses Gun and Eartha Kitt. (Another recording that was published in 1969 but subsequently withdrawn from the Caedmon catalogue was entitled *Folk Tales of Tribes of Africa.*) Holdridge and Mantell appear to have some ambivalence about capitalizing on the Black Studies market. [25] As outlined by Mantell, Caedmon did not jump on what she calls "the Black Studies bandwagon." As she notes simply: "We did what needed to be done."

With the exception of Black Studies materials, federal funding initiatives for educational spoken word recordings peaked during Johnson's presidency. By the late 1960s, Caedmon had clearly lost market share in the educational field to rival Spoken Arts. The educational field was also serviced by Yale and Harvard, both of which continued to record contemporary American poets, and by a variety of commercial labels such CMS as Columbia Records' in-house Caedmon imitator. Clearly, the popular and educational markets for theatrical recordings had also reached some kind of saturation point. The engine that drove the larger Caedmon enterprise, the record-buying clubs, stalled in 1968. The rhetorical energies that underwrote America's Cold War reading crusade were long gone. After the turn to dramatic recording, Caedmon had failed to develop new genres of secondary orality that reflected the aesthetic performance of the spoken word in primary performance contexts. It had rejected the idea of recording Allen Ginsberg, for example.

Smaller and more transient record labels continued to record poetry. Fantasy Records alone exhibited a sustained commitment to recording poetry as a primary performance genre throughout the late 1950s and early 1960s. Beginning in 1957, Fantasy had recorded Ginsberg, Ferlinghetti, Rexroth, Bean and others.[26] These LPs were effectively at the scene of a field of American counter-culture spoken word recording that began to consolidate more intensively in 1967.[27] (Perhaps coincidentally, this was the year in which the widespread involvement of the CIA in the American cultural industry was first widely recognized.) In sum, the moment of postwar "mass culture" was over.

Caedmon responded to the collapse of the spoken word industry by investigating new forms of voice recording media. It began releasing new recordings in audiotape formats beginning in 1968. The audiocassette was not archived by schools and libraries with anything like the frequency that the LP had been, however. Nor were trade markets for spoken word audiocassettes particularly strong. The "audiocassette moment" really only developed in the 1980s in the wake of the introduction of no-hiss Dolby B audiotape and even more importantly with the introduction of the Sony Walkman as a portable playback device. Audiocassette culture was essentially a "fourth wave" media technology. The real thrust of Caedmon's vision for the 1970s lay in a proposal to capitalize on federal funding initiatives to develop 16-mm filmstrips as basal educational materials. Argo had already launched a successful educational filmstrip series. As it had in the moments of the monaural and stereo LP, Caedmon entered the race to "Americanize" this software.

Caedmon first attempted to follow Argo into the new field in 1968 when it began to produce the first in a projected series of ten filmstrips entitled *What is Poetry?* In working with the filmstrip medium, Caedmon faced a significant obstacle that it had not faced with monaural or stereo LPs. The launching a catalogue devoted to educational filmstrips required massive amounts of capital. The projected costs of the first filmstrip alone were estimated at $30,000. LPs had been produced for less than a tenth of this amount. In considering how they might finance a switch to projects in the filmstrip medium, Holdridge and Mantell reached the conclusion that new financing would be required. They decided that this could best be achieved by selling Caedmon to a larger interest that could provide the necessary cash flow. They would continue to work for Caedmon—as salaried executives—while slowly working into the new medium.

The crisis facing Caedmon was not merely one of technical innovation and market saturation, however. A sea change in the structure of American capital was marginalizing medium-sized companies in both the print publishing and recording businesses. At this juncture, larger conglomerates were buying out all of the smaller independent companies in both fields of cultural production. This shift had a profound impact on the print publishing and sound recording industries. New modes of industrial production based on short-term gain rather than long-term returns, or long-term editorial judgment, were overtaking both fields.[28] The acquisition of independent print publishing houses and record companies had a number of secondary effects that were impeding Caedmon's ability to stay in business. As Mantell describes the events leading up to selling Caedmon: "People were selling their companies. Independent distributors were going to record companies. There were no independents, so we had to hustle to find others." Although they had been able to maintain an effective business relationship, for personal reasons Caedmon's founders had not been on good personal terms since 1954. As Mantell notes frankly: "Two men who had the relationship as partners that we did would have broken up. We able to keep our eye on the goal and the bottom line." Holdridge and Mantell had been approached regarding the sale of their company several times in the past. With the change in conditions of production, they began to be eager to sell.

Several interests had already investigated acquiring the company during the 1950s and 1960s. Edward Fadiman, the brother of the Book-of-the-Month Club's Clifton Fadiman, approached Holdridge and Mantell with a proposal to buy their fledgling enterprise in 1953; the comedian Chubby Checkers had also made an offer to buy

Caedmon. Holdridge and Mantell began to entertain more serious feelers beginning in 1963 when several media conglomerates of different sizes including *The New Yorker*, *The New York Times* newspaper, the educational division of *Time* and CBS investigated buying the label; the educational publisher McGraw-Hill also considered acquiring the company. *Time* and McGraw-Hill made offers that Holdridge and Mantell rejected because they were too low. In the fall of 1967, Caedmon entered into more serious negotiations with the Cromwell-Collier Macmillan. These progressed to the point where the educational publisher indicated that it was prepared to make an offer of between four and six million dollars. That offer was later withdrawn. This corporate pairing would have been less than ideal given what Mantell terms an "anal, petty, pompous" corporate culture. This match in corporate cultures was important because Mantell and Holdridge were essentially looking for financing and cash flow. They wanted to continue to run the Caedmon enterprise.

After this deal fell through, Holdridge and Mantell initiated a series of attempts to sell their company. At this juncture, Ashley Famous/MCA theatrical agent Bobby Brenner, who had represented many of the actors who performed for Caedmon, also approached the record company with a proposal to broker a sale for a five percent fee. Brenner set his sights on 3-M. He asked for a price of $5.6 million but 3-M's interest dissipated after they saw Caedmon's sales figures. Brenner then turned his attentions to GRT, a California-based audiocassette interest that specialized in popular music recordings. These negotiations progressed to quite an advanced stage but collapsed after GRT's accountants examined Caedmon's books. In the spring and summer of 1969, Holdridge and Mantell decided to independently approach Houghton Mifflin. As Mantell recalls: "They were respectful, liked what we did. They understood what we did. They understood its use in the classroom. They were intelligent. They behaved properly. We liked them. They were nice." Like other potential buyers, Houghton Mifflin was not willing to pay the price that Caedmon wanted, however.

Brenner seems to have understood better than Holdridge and Mantell exactly what kind of corporate fit was needed. The next potential buyer he brought forward was the Xerox photocopy interest. Caedmon began exploring the possibility of an acquisition by Xerox in January of 1970. Soon afterwards, Xerox made a tentative offer of $3 million, to be paid in stock. The offer was significantly less that Caedmon's asking price but Xerox stock was rising rapidly in value at the time. Xerox also had a reputation for a friendly corporate culture, which clearly appealed to Mantell. As she recalls: "We liked the Xerox people. They were interested. They had similar aspirations and a similar market." However, at the same time that Brenner was trying to broker that deal, another corporate suitor approached Caedmon. With assets of over $1.1 Billion, Raytheon was then the eighty-seventh largest conglomerate in the United States. Today, Raytheon is well known for its position in the development of Star Wars technology and as the developer of the problematic Patriot missile defense system. The company's base was and remains the armaments industry. During the heart of the Vietnam War, sales of its main product—weapons—were clearly booming.[29] The conglomeration had deeper pockets than the other corporations that investigated acquiring the record label: it was willing to pay the four million dollar asking price.

For a variety of reasons, Holdridge and Mantell preferred the Xerox option but Caedmon was left with only one option when Xerox lost interest. Raytheon acquired Caedmon on May 28, 1970. Astonishingly, Raytheon's position in the American military-industrial complex did not initially deter Holdridge and Mantell as dyed-in-the-wool New York liberals. When queried by me as to whether or not she had any reservations about Raytheon's role in the American defense industry, Mantell responded frankly: "Of course it bothered me. They were war criminals! It was not a natural pairing. [But] we were tired of talking. Also, the money was good. Who could have foreseen the increasingly unpleasant years?" As Mantell avers with characteristic candor: "There was also the greed element." There were also a number of benefits to the Raytheon deal in addition to the selling price. Holdridge and Mantell would continue the day-to-day running of Caedmon under the direction of executives of Raytheon subsidiary D.C. Heath. Raytheon would finance the increased production schedule that was necessary to remain competitive in the LP and audiocassette formats. Holdridge and Mantell also assumed—incorrectly as it turned out—that Raytheon's deep pockets would found a switch to the filmstrip medium.

In fact, the Caedmon/Raytheon deal was jinxed from the start because he acquisition price was based on two variables that were not fixed beforehand. In contrast to other stock-based deals that Caedmon had considered, the Raytheon deal was based on "less stock down, more on the come," as Mantell recalls. Under the agreement of sale, Holdridge and Mantell were each paid one million shares in Raytheon stock. The sale price was based on the average price of Raytheon stock during the thirty days after the agreement to close was signed. Unpredictably, during this thirty-day period, Raytheon stock rose dramatically in value from $18 to $30 a share. As a result, each partner's shares were worth considerably more at the end of that period than Raytheon had anticipated. This factor set a certain tone that impacted on the second variable, or the buyout package that Caedmon's two founders were due to receive at the end of their five-year period of service as salaried executives, which was based on performance incentives.

However, there were immediate conflicts between the cultures of the two companies as major changes were imposed on the way that Caedmon did business. Most notably, D. C. Heath/Raytheon imposed a traditional corporate hierarchy upon Caedmon in which Mantell effectively became Holdridge's superior. (Mantell assumed responsibilities in product development while Holdridge was demoted to a position overseeing trade sales.) Another change was a new industrial production schedule that required Caedmon to produce thirty-five records each spring season and thirty-five records each fall season. As a result, Caedmon was required to produce genres of recordings that it had never published in the past, including science fiction recordings and comedy records. Product development was now clearly driven by a consideration of "the bottom line." If trade product in the post-acquisition period was driven by a consideration of what would sell, educational product was driven by market research. D.C. Health hired Carole Haubert as an educational sales director. Her job was to investigate curriculum materials that were used for different grades and to develop voice recordings that would compliment the existing curriculum. In essence, Caedmon now gave educational markets materials that reflected their curriculum instead of providing that market with materials that were a reflection of Holdridge and Mantell's own tastes and interests.

The two partners differed in their responses to these changes. Holdridge was appalled at the product that was being published under the Caedmon imprint and was openly oppositional. In contrast, Mantell was determined to work with D.C. Heath. As she notes pragmatically: "You've already done T.S. Eliot, and you have to keep going." Essentially, Mantell was willing to learn the principles that drive the large-scale industrial production of symbolic commodities. She recalls that she and Holdridge had never learned how to price the viability of a particular project in advance other than intuitively. It was only in the post-acquisition period that Mantell learned the fundamental commercial preposition that any project began with the factoring in of a twenty percent profit margin, which was followed by the adding in of other costs. In contrast, Holdridge remained tied to the principles of intuition and long-term editorial judgment, which traditionally structured the mid-size field. As Holdridge frames Caedmon's pre-acquisition editorial decisions: "We didn't pay attention to marketing, to swings in taste. We didn't pay attention to other people's suggestions—unless they were good ones. We did what we wanted to do, what we felt was the best in each category."

Some of the conflict between Caedmon's founders and the D.C. Heath/ Raytheon executives was personal, however. In explaining the attempts of D.C. Heath/Raytheon management the reshape the Caedmon enterprise, Mantell notes: "Their motivation apart from the corporate financial motivation . . . . Their personal motivation was that their wives had gone to Wellesley, and who were these New York Jews with their attitude? We weren't as well brought-up. We didn't wear white gloves. They knew more." Mantell concedes that the Raytheon corporate culture was misogynist and anti-Semitic. "That's the way they were," she notes simply. Mantell also frames Raytheon's anti-Semitic corporate culture as "a question of scale" specifically in relation to her experience as a Jewish refugee. As she notes: "You have to understand I came out of that. From Berlin, into a school in Paris—and had not only to speak French but to be French—and then go out of school into school in London and be English, and out of London and into school in New York, and drop the English accent and speak Manhattan, and go into Brooklyn and speak Brooklyn. You know, I'm adaptive." However, Holdridge was less "flexible," as Mantell recalls.[30]

Many of the difficulties between Caedmon and D.C. Heath also arose purely from business decisions and predictably, Holdridge appears to have been the most incensed by these because they applied to her own area of expertise. Mantell suggests that Raytheon itself was "well-run, aside from the fact that it was making munitions." Dean Laux, the head of D.C. Heath, who had made his name as a computer programmer at IBM, did not share that expertise, however. Much of the conflict between Laux and Caedmon's founders centered on methods of distributing Caedmon product. Laux suspended Caedmon's international distribution system; he also terminated Caedmon's domestic distribution agreements including the nine-year relationship that the company had enjoyed with Houghton Mifflin. Instead, D.C. Health, a textbook company with no national distribution system of its own, assumed distribution of Caedmon's recordings. Laux also blocked Caedmon's expansion into the audiocassette field by insisting that Caedmon award all of its audiocassette sales to an associate of his. All of these tactics were extremely disruptive to Caedmon's already declining markets. In the ten-month period after they were implemented, sales declined rapidly and did not improve significantly until the second half of 1973. From Holdridge's point of view, this mismanagement was so extreme that she would later allege it was a deliberate attempt to sabotage Caedmon in order to defraud herself and Mantell of their legitimate buyout. She filed a lawsuit against Raytheon in 1975, which Mantell joined, which was subsequently settled out of court in their favor.

The disposition of the Caedmon enterprise clearly changed during the post-acquisition period. However, Caedmon published many recordings of literary merit during this era, including T.S. Eliot's recordings of *The Four Quartets* and *The Waste Land* and the recordings of James Joyce that it had so long coveted. It also released "first edition" recordings of poets Robinson Jeffers, James Dickey and W.S. Mervin. Caedmon continued to draw on the Dylan Thomas archive and to posthumously publish archival recordings of other poets such as Theodore Roethke. Caedmon also began to move in a new direction towards recordings of contemporary fiction with the publication of two albums of Kurt Vonnegut reading from *Slaughterhouse Five* and *Cat's Cradle*; this kind of spoken word recording can be seen as the genesis of the audio book as a fourth wave spoken word recording genre.

It is tempting to assume that the influence of D.C. Heath/Raytheon on the Caedmon catalogue was entirely negative. However, clearly such a reading cannot be sustained, particularly with the addition of recordings of female poets. Holdridge and Mantell had rejected many female authors and poets as recording candidates on the grounds that their reputations would not survive what Mantell terms "long-term editorial judgement." The feminist tastes of the Raytheon wives, and of Carole Haubert, changed this. It was only in the post-acquisition era, for example, that Muriel Rukeyser was added to the Caedmon catalogue. Feminist poets, including Margaret Atwood and Marilyn Hacker, were also recorded in the post-acquisition period; archival recordings of other female writers such as Anais Nin were also added.

One of the last recording sessions that Caedmon undertook for the label, with the poet Anne Sexton, was part of this series. Sexton was recorded reading a selection of her poetry from collections of different periods, including *To Bedlam and Part Way Back, All My Pretty Ones* and *Transformations.* However, recording Sexton was fraught by many of the difficulties that had dogged the Caedmon enterprise from the very earliest days of Holdridge's and Mantell's association with other self-destructive and unstable figures in that the "intimacy" that Caedmon sought to simulate in the recording studio was not sustained once the recording session was over. As Mantell recalls of these recording sessions and their aftermath: "Many of these writers . . . are extremely needy." Both of Caedmon's founders acknowledge that poets who recorded for Caedmon may have been unhappy with the aftermath of their recording sessions. As Mantell notes with typical honesty: "I assume that a lot of them were unhappy or disgruntled, or appalled, or certainly disappointed, that the amount of attention that we lavished on them before the recording session vanished later." Speaking of Sexton in particular, she recalls: "There was a lot of conversation before—and a lot of it afterwards." Mantell listened to Sexton sympathetically for a period of time. However, at certain point she recalls: "It was just too much. You know, I can only do so much." Mantell also appears to have been wracked with guilt about this aftermath of this particular recording session, as Sexton committed suicide shortly afterwards. However, she also remembers that when she shared this sentiment with Sexton's lawyer, at the poet's funeral, he assured her that nothing could have prevented it.

Holdridge and Mantell left Caedmon when their contracts with Raytheon expired on May 28 of 1975. The technical translation of the textual and dramatic traditions into the LP had been completed. Holdridge and Mantell's collective positions and position takings during the monaural LP moment in particular had clearly shaped the disposition of the LP medium and that of the field of spoken word recording as a whole. The spoken word industry was then poised on the brink of the fourth wave of post-print media. The "audiocassette moment" would bring about new genres of secondary orality and secondary literacy as well as a new field of producers. The "audiocassette moment" was followed by the emergence of the spoken word as a secondary performance genre during the "video cassette" moment, as part of the fourth and last wave of post-alphabetical audiovisual mass media before the reunification of the symbolic in digital media and the end of the era analog media, which had began a century before with Eastman and Edison. The legacy of modern literature on LP would soon be set to music—during another moment of intermedia—in the popular music industry of the early 1970s.[31] Many of the secondary spoken word genres favored by Caedmon would also appear on foundation-sponsored public television, which emerged in 1969.

Caedmon remained part of the Raytheon conglomerate until it was sold to Harper Collins in 1988. The acquisition of the Caedmon archive by Harper Collins signaled a second life for the legacy of the Caedmon *read text* catalogue in particular, as Harper Audio began to translate the Caedmon "core collection"—first into Dolby B audiocassette formats and then into the CD medium—even as the audio book industry as a whole began to become a publicity vehicle for authors' most recent works in ways that Holdridge and Mantell had always resisted. Holdridge and Mantell began new professional lives after they left Caedmon. Although Holdridge is now retired, she operated Stemmer House, a publisher of art design books, from her seventeenth-century farmhouse in the outskirts of Baltimore until very recently. Now retired and living in Florida, Mantell in contrast founded Films for the Humanities with her husband Harold, a former documentary filmmaker for the USIA. The Mantells began the Films for the Humanities enterprise in the 16mm-filmstrip medium. However, with the development of videocassettes, they effectively began the "Caedmon" enterprise all over again during the "video moment." In time, Films for the Humanities became the world's largest publisher of educational software in the videocassette medium.

---

[1] Caedmon also published Osbert Sitwell's *Wrack at Tidesend* that year. These appear to have been the first and last books that the company published. Print publishing was a much more expensive than LP

---

publishing. As a consequence, Caedmon's print publishing efforts were restricted to editions of free domain works as companions to their LP recordings.

[2] A Columbia University professor, Van Doren was the author of the wartime book *Liberal Education*. The wartime poetry anthologiest had been one of the first authors to have his books banned in America. Four of his works were banned in New Jersey City Junior College in January of 1951 on the grounds of his supposed communist sympathies. The ban was lifted later that year, however. See *The New York Times*, Jan. 26, 1951, p. 15; Feb. 21, 1952, p. 16; Nov. 17, 1951, p. 15.

[3] By recording Anderson, a versatile Australian actress who had been well recorded in LP voice media, Caedmon was signaling its entry in the field of popular cultural production. Anderson's performance of *Medea* had been a hit on Broadway in 1947 but more importantly the play had been the first play to be recorded in the LP medium.

[4] While Sackler rehearsed the actors, Mantell investigated the possibilities of local literary recordings. She targeted Christopher Isherwood and Aldous Huxley but rejected Isherwood on the grounds there was no commercial appeal for his writing. Huxley showed up for a recording session but did not prove amenable to ceding editorial judgment to the twenty-four year old Mantell and chose to record an account of his experiences using mescalin. From Mantell's point of view, this was clearly unsuitable as a commercial recording. Years later, when the cultural climate was much more receptive to drug use, Mantell went looking for the Huxley recordings in Caedmon's tape storage room only to find that several tapes in the series were missing, which precluded the possibility of releasing such a record.

[5] That association had a particular cultural subtext. Nine months after his first Caedmon recording was released, Karloff shot to momentary fame on the television program *The $64,000 Question*. Karloff had chosen "fairy tales" as his subject and such was his knowledge of the genre that he reached the highest plateau of the game. However, he refused to answer the last question on advice from his lawyer on the grounds that the income tax he would have to pay would reduce his winnings below the $32,000 he had already won (Nollen 336).

[6] Caedmon's children's' recordings constituted a significant portion of the catalogue. Recordings of the works Rudyard Kipling as performed by Karloff were particularly prominent. However, the titles and publication dates of these recordings are extraordinarily difficult to document. They were not always listed in the Schwann LP Record Catalogue and they were not typically archived in public and college or university sound recording libraries. The fact that sound recordings were not required to be dated by law until 1976 has also hampered a reconstruction of the Caedmon's catalogue of children's recordings. For this reason, I have omitted this genre of recordings from the discography that is included at the end of this dissertation.

[7] As with its other *spoken text* genres, Caedmon's offering in this genre was shaped by the "positions" of other record companies in the wider field of spoken word recording. In July of that year, for example, London-Decca released a French language recording of Charles Boyer reading acts of French democratic rhetoric. The same month, Decca released a recording of Orson Welles reading Lincoln's Gettysburg Address as paired with a reading of Emile Zola's "Truth and Justice Cost Too Dear."

[8] Interview recordings seem to have been particularly politically charged with reference to Cold War cultural politics as in the case of Cocteau and Russell but also in the case of interview recordings of Frank Lloyd Wright and Henry Mencken, which were also released in 1958 and 1959. While Wright was a former leftist, his achievements had been spectacularized by the American State Department in an exhibition that toured Europe between 1951 and 1952 (Stonor Saunders 114). Mencken was a well-known journalist and advocate of American English but also a Cold Warrior who, like Russell, was anti-communist enough to have once advocated nuclear warfare against the Soviet Union (Whitfield 5).

[9] In particular, the social circulation of the Lorca recording is somewhat uncertain. It was first announced in the *Schwann Record Playing Catalogue* early in 1958. However, the date that it became available to the American public is somewhat indeterminate. Mantell recalls that it was published only in 1967 and in a very small pressing of two hundred and fifty records. (It is uncertain whether or not the Caedmon TC number 1067 is interfering with Mantell's memory or whether the record did in fact only become available at that time.) Mantell also recalls that the RCA pressing plant inadvertently coupled *Side A* of the Lorca record with another very different musical recording—"The Beer Barrel Polka," which was not part of the Caedmon catalogue—but that sales of the Lorca record were so slow that no one complained about this until five years later. This inadvertent coupling would seem to suggest that Lorca recording may have been

pressed as part of ideological agenda rather than a purely commercial sound-document, given that this anthem had served as a sonic index to signify the presence of American Armed Forces during the Second World War although such a reading must remain speculative (Fussell 188).

[10] Caedmon's decision to record Belloc represented its now established tactic of mimicking the voice documents of the historical sound recording archive. The children's author had first approached Columbia Records in 1928; the label recorded Belloc but did not commercially release his recordings. Instead, Belloc subsequently had two records privately pressed in 1932. See David Mason, liner notes, *Great Literary Figures*, CD, (London: EMI, 1999).

[11] As noted by Kittler, innovations in postwar stereo have their roots in military communication technologies of WW II. In this sense, the use of military stereophony during WW II was in many ways a technical supplement to the role that military stereography had played in WW I.

[12] Because of financial difficulties, Argo was taken over by London-Decca in 1957, which marketed the MRS series under the London imprint in the United States.

[13] Kenneth S. Rothwell, *A History of Shakespeare on Screen: A Century of Film and Television*; Robert F. Willson's "Selected Offshots: Shakespeare at War, on Broadway, in the Mob, in Space, and on the Range" in *Shakespeare in Hollywood 1929-1956*; and Douglas Lanier "WSHX: Shakespeare and American Radio" in *Shakespeare After Mass Media* (Ed. Richard Burt).

[14] As outlined by Rothwell, Olivier's contributions to this field during this period and slightly beforehand included the celebrated *Henry V*, which was released in 1944, his 1948 *Hamlet* and his 1955 *Othello.* Those of Welles, in contrast, included his 1948 *Macbeth* and his 1952 *Othello* as well as his intertextually-influenced films *Citizen Kane* (1941), *The Magnificent Ambersons* (1942), *The Lady from Shanghai* (1946) and *A Touch of Evil* (1958).

[15] The Mercury Texts were a byproduct of the tours of the anti-fascist *Julius Caesar* as mounted by the Mercury Theatre through various American schools. As such, they were part of the politicization of Shakespeare in educational contexts. Speaking in a rhetoric that explicitly Americanized this public sphere, the drama critic Harold J. Kennedy, who gave lectures that proceeded these Mercury Theatre educational productions, noted: "To me it seems that there is more triumph for Shakespeare in four students talking intelligently about 'Julius Caesar' over doughnuts and coffee than there has ever been in all the Shakespearean discussions which had gone on at pink teas for centuries" (as cited in Anderegg 28).

[16] The script that was used for *Macbeth* began: "This is ______, for the Shakespeare Recording Society. Etc. In this series, we shall be turning our spotlight upon a wide assortment of great characters from the tragedies and comedies of William Shakespeare, illuminating their inner thoughts, their outward actions, their impact on our world and theirs." The script proceeded to intersperse excerpts from Caedmon's recording of *Macbeth* with scripted elaboration on the meaning of the play as voiced by radio announcers. One of these voice-overs, for example, reads: "Macbeth is a superstitious man. Not for a moment does he question the reality of the witches or the truthfulness of their prophecy. But he is not a man who can act alone. The accomplice he must have is his wife . . . ."

[17] Later in 1962 or 1963, when the SRS series was comparatively well established, Caedmon, like many other wholesale book and record-buying clubs, conducted a market survey to find out who the members of the SRS club were. As Mantell later recounted this typically informal process: "We simply picked up the phone and called everyone within local calling distance—and we got a Con Ed worker, a Bell Telephone switchboard operator, a diamond cutter, doctors." Unlike many in the publishing community, including the Book-of-the-Month Club, Caedmon declined to conduct more formal research of this type—perhaps because what might be conceptualized as a "hail" to a non class-differentiated audience was central to the company's self-defined mission. Determining the economic status of SRS consumers would have been counter-productive to the political and philosophical engagements of this "hail." (Disposition of Marianne Mantell, p. 450.)

[18] Among these were Kennedy's speech in front of the Democratic National Convention, in July of 1960; excerpts from the Kennedy-Nixon debates; Kennedy's address to the nation on the occasion of the Bay of Pigs crisis, in April of 1961; his report on his September 1961 meeting with Khrushchev in Vienna in September of that year; and the Race for Space address which was given at Rice University in September of 1962. Kennedy's speech on the occasion of the Cuba crisis in October of 1962, his report to the nation on the Civil Rights issue and the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty in June and July of 1963, and his West Berlin address, which was given in June of that year, were also included.

---

[19] According to Stonor Saunders, that organ received $523,000 from the Ford Foundation for this purpose (142, 246). The New York based Chekhov Publishers was also the center of a controversy between the American and Soviet governments at the September 1959 USIA cultural and trade exhibition mounted outside Moscow when the Soviets demanded the removal of materials they had published from the American exhibition (Hixon 190).

[20] See "Red and Anti-Red Curbs on Art Denounced by U.S. Playwright," *The New York Times*, 13 Feb. 1956 p. 9 and "Cultural Group Rebukes Miller," *The New York Times*, 14 Feb. 14, 1956, p. 5.

[21] See *The New York Times*, Feb. 13, 1966, p. 24.

[22] Perhaps coincidentally, the disposition of the Caedmon catalogue at this juncture corresponds fairly closely to that of the Voice of America lectures on popular American literature of this period. For a representative sampling of those lectures, see Basic Books' 1969 *Landmarks of American Writing*.

[23] Even the relatively tame version of Hughes's stories that was recorded by Davis was returned by at least one school board—in Salem, Virginia—on the grounds that the school's audiovisual consultant found the recording to be profane and immoral.

[24] Quayle also assumed Karloff's role of performing the children's stories of Rudyard Kipling with the release of a recording entitled *Rikki Tiki* and performed on another children's recording entitled *King of the Golden River*.

[25] Indeed, educators themselves appear to have had some ambivalence and even hostility about this funding to the extent that they were willing to divert such funding into other areas, such as school supplies. As Mantell notes frankly: "If you are a teacher in the U.S. and you are given money to buy non-textbooks, non-basal materials, and you need erasers for your blackboard, you will find a way . . . of couching your purchase order in such a way that it will sound like you are getting a whole wad of Black Study materials. Only the word "study" is wrong and a blackboard eraser is black. People got what they wanted, what they needed."

[26] Smaller spoken labels joined the counter-culture field of production. These included the small Hanover label, which released an anthology that included readings by Ferlinghetti, Duncan, Spicer, Rexroth, Ginsberg, and McLure among others; Hanover had also released two records of Jack Kerouac, who had also been recorded by the more commercial Verve label.

[27] Spoken word recording took a dramatic turn that year with the release of two counter-culture records on the Broadside label: the LP *Psychedelic Experience* was narrated by Timothy Leary; another LP entitled *Poems for Peace* involved the performances of twelve counter-culture poets including Allen Ginsberg and Jackson Mac Low. Rounding out the new alternative recordings was an LP by William Burroughs on the small esp label that contained his performance of *Naked Lunch* and other selections.

[28] The historical take-over of independent print publishing houses of the postwar period by industrial and military-industrial conglomerates has recently been analyzed by Jason Epstein and André Schifferin.

[29] Raytheon was historically a force in the field of electronic communication hardware and electronic home entertainment hardware and particularly in the area of television components. By acquiring Caedmon, it was essentially moving into the software market. Raytheon had already diversified into other areas in the field of cultural and knowledge production. It had acquired Atheneum, a print publishing house and the educational textbook company, D.C. Heath, which would later become Caedmon's parent company.

[30] Holdridge has declined to speak about Caedmon's acquisition by Raytheon in interviews. She has, however, provided me with access to the extensive court documents to the suit that she subsequently filed against Raytheon.

[31] Carrie Noland, "Rimbaud and Patti Smith: The Discoveries of Modern Poetry and the Popular Music Industry," *Poetry at the Stake: Lyric Aesthetics and the Challenge of Technology*, pp. 163-184.

Chapter Five
"The Two Caedmons at the Controls:" Postmodern Sound

Read and *spoken text* recordings were voiced supplements to written texts. However, beginning in the audiotape era the voice of the poet was not only recorded. It was also engineered. Caedmon's distinctive sound recording, sound editing, and production values therefore supplemented any particular writer or actor's verbal performance. Caedmon's sound production values were *synchronically* distinctive within the field of spoken word recording. However, they were equally if not more distinctive *diachronically* in relation to the differences between second wave and third wave—or modern and postmodern—sound recording. As a publisher of the spoken word, Caedmon was key in the development of a postmodern sound recording aesthetic. To the degree they involved a configuration of what film critic Jean-Louis Beaudry has called "the transcendental listening subject," these sound recording and sound reproduction values were not only aesthetic but also ideological (Williams 60).

Caedmon was founded, to some extent, to supplement the print publishing legacy of Horace Liveright. While Holdridge's experience laid the foundation of the Caedmon enterprise, initially Caedmon seemed to center on Mantell's areas of expertise. The sound recording venture was clearly linked through Bartók and Mantell to the postwar "audio revolution" and the "cult of high fidelity." In addition to Mantell's technical know-how and her contacts in the recording business, Mantell contributed a certain degree of "sound sense" to the Caedmon enterprise that derived from her musical training and secondarily from her facility with languages. Forced to learn new languages constantly as a child, she developed an aural acuity that tested in the abnormally high range; as result, she typically heard sounds that others could not perceive. It was this sound sense that helped Mantell to grasp the potential of the postwar voice and sound media in disseminating not only music but also the sound-saturated medium of poetry.

As Mantell explains her sound-centered view of poetry: "Basically, poetry was always a spoken medium. The purpose of rhyme and meter was to make it easier to remember. Poetry came before writing. All I wanted to do was to take poetry back where it was before the typographical innovations of the early twentieth century."

Mantell's insistence on orality goes against the grain of the modernist experiment to some extent. Although there are considerable differences in the interplay between sound and image in any instance of modernist poetry, its typographical dissonance generally privileged the eye over the ear. Mantell's perspective also circumvented the discourse on rhythm, measure and the fixing of poetry in typographical "regimes" after the invention of the printing press and the sonic dissonance of modernist mixed meter in particular. In essence, Mantell is invoking a Hellenistic discourse on poetry's oral origins in the context of secondary orality.

More generally, Mantell also suggests that the voice of the poet performing his or her own work "illuminates" their work in singular ways. As she frames the value of a spoken word recording: "The voice of the poet is going to tell you something about the poem that the poet may not necessarily know he put in there. It's not only which words in a line are stressed, where the natural line breaks as opposed to what they teach you in poetics you should be doing, it's . . . Where does it hurt? Where is it coming from? Where is it quiet? Where is it louder?"

Mantell is essentially positing the author's vocal performance as a source or origin of meaning. The idea of this source or origin was fundamental to the Caedmon enterprise. As Mantell recalls: "My purpose was not to entertain the audience—it wasn't enough to teach about the poetry—it was to capture another critical source, what the poet heard inside his or her head." Consistently, Holdridge and Mantell would make the assumption that poets and authors had an "inner voice" that they heard as they wrote, and that this inner voice revealed the creativity and inspiration of literary works—and particularly poetic works—in ways that the printed page alone could not. Caedmon's mandate was to capture this authorial "inner voice," which Caedmon referred to as "the third dimension of the printed page."

It is essential to acknowledge that recording and reproducing this *inner voice* was not in fact self-identical with a poet or author's *actual speaking voice*. Instead, Mantell frames this process as "an intuitive search for the sound of the *inner voice* instead of the *spoken voice*." She notes that capturing this "inner voice" was a question of producing a realistic reflection not only of what the person reading actually sounded like but also of obtaining "as much verisimilitude to what the poet thought he sounded like." To the degree that inner voice represents a construction or representation of a speech event rather than a mere recording of that event, this difference involves is one between sound recording and sound figuration. Ultimately, this "inner voice" was achieved in the sound recording and sound editing process. If this inner voice was *supplemental* to the author's act of utterance in the recording context, it was also in some sense *prior* to the act of writing in ways that are philosophically resonant. To some degree, Mantell is re-inscribing the romantic myth of poetic inspiration, as well as the power of disembodied spoken word as Logos as was one the foundational tropes of secondary orality. Contemporary critics such as Garrett Stewart have also deconstructed that myth. Invoking Derrida, Stewart suggests that this type of inner audition "subscribe[s] to a myth of an originary Voice before the letter" (3).

"Inner voice" and authorial "essence" underwrote the deployment of poets' and authors' voiced readings as supplements to their written works throughout the decade of secondary orality. These tropes were clearly related to "author cult" as a product of both media shift and Cold War cultural politics. However, equally importantly author cult has to be seen in relation to the cultural authority being gained by the New Critics during the postwar period. Intuitively, Mantell appears to have recognized that postwar voice media had the utopian potential to connect poets with their audiences in radically new ways that circumvented both the medium of print, or publishing regimes, and the academic mediation of literary texts, or interpretive regimes. In this sense, she was redeeming the democratic potential of the LP medium in the service of mass communication and mass education. Mantell resented the academic mediation of literary texts in particular and much of her hostility was directed towards the New Criticism. Like the majority of the Columbia faculty, Mantell found this interpretive apparatus to be "a colossal waste of time." In general, Mantell found literary criticism was "self-important, presumptuous, silly." She suggests that such criticism was inevitably about the critic himself and not the work that was its ostensible subject. As Mantell explains: "There was so much analytical garbage being written that I wanted to find another *original* source."

That source was not merely the product of a poet or author's voice practice but also of good sound production values that supplemented authorial "essence." An authorial voice practice effectively provided the raw sound text of any particular *read text* spoken word recording. This raw speech event was then "cooked" into a public spoken word document. In the analogue era of full sound spectrum recording and playback, the production of a public voice document involved (1) the recording of a sound-event in magnetic audiotape; (2) the editing of that raw performance event in order to produce a master-tape; (3) the subsequent production of a record master and the production of mothers and stampers from this master; and (4) the mechanical pressing of copies.

The first of these processes involved the voicing of a literary text as a speech event. This primary speech event was then subjected to sound recording, sound editing and sound engineering values that conditioned its reproduction in secondary performance contexts. This engineering significantly altered the nature of the original speech event to such an extent that it fundamentally changed the relationship between speech-figure and sonic ground and even elements as basic as the pitch and tempo of a particular speech event. As a "first edition" voice publisher, Caedmon was involved in the recording of a speech event. It was also involved in editing that event and producing a tape master. Caedmon brought certain sound production values to bear upon each of these stages of production. Throughout this chapter, I will refer to these as Caedmon's "sound-signature."

From a production-centred perspective, a *read text* performance involves the stylization of phonemes, words, syntax, and poetic and prose lines in the medium of spoken language. In general, there very different relations between figure and ground in written and spoken language. Unlike the black and white of graphemes and of various diacritical signs that distinguish written language the speech-stream is continuous; each sound merges into the next. The body itself is also the material ground of spoken language. The speaker's voice as a signifying apparatus produces a series of linguistic signs that constitute language as a symbolic system. The linguistic code is modified by the production of extra-linguistic signs that reveal the identities of socially characterized speakers—including gender, class, and regional or civic place of origin as well as biological indices, such as age. The linguistic code can also be modified by techniques of iconic or creative stylization—including abstract stylization and acoustic mimesis—

which are part of performance of public speech as an art form. Essentially, the sound-text is the product of these three forms of sonic signification.

However, sound recording does not involve the mere reproduction of a spoken word performance event because speech events are not only *produced* but also *perceived.* From a reception-centered perspective, different forms of noise ground the articulation of the speech stream. The speaking body produces non-linguistic sounds in the form of sighs, coughs, and various errors and repetitions. These sounds are signs of physical presence but do not signify in linguistic terms. Various extraneous environmental sounds are also part of any sound-event. Technically noise, these sounds don't signify. Instead, they involve the ambient sounds that John Cage recognized as "silence." Together, these two kinds of sounds constitute the ground of any speech event.

In general, there are also fundamentally different relations between figure and ground in conditions of primary and secondary or technologized o/aurality. In a primary listening context, noise does not interfere with the processing of sound-signs. This is because the brain attends to some sounds and ignores others. In a primary listening context, the ear filters the heterogeneity of raw sound in order to privilege the linguistic code and other information-bearing sounds. The ear fails to transmit to the brain all non-significant sounds; it will privilege signifying sounds with relatively low amplitudes while filtering out the roar of non-signifying silence. Conditions of primary and secondary aurality differ because a recording apparatus records all sounds. These are recorded according to their amplitude and proximity to the recording apparatus; noise frequently drowns out quieter sound-signs/The recording apparatus, then, is not capable of the psychological act of imposing figure/ground relations. Without different forms of sound-figuration—primarily through the use of microphones—sound recording would reproduce all the sounds that the brain typically filters out.

In the case of voice documents, the recording process is typically manipulated in order to amplify the voice as a signifying sound. These sound recording techniques arise because of the necessity of clarifying the linguistic signal. When recording a spoken word event, a sound recording engineer fundamentally (re)constructs verbal sound-signs and sonic ground in a way that compensates for the editing operations of the ear in primary performance contexts. The engineer also simulates a relationship between a speaker and an audient or audience according to her or her largely unconscious standard as to what constitutes good sound. For this reason, the reproduction of a speech event necessarily involves the construction of what Alan Williams after Jean-Louis Baudry calls "a surrogate listening facility" (61). This is because an auditor or audience is situated in a particular spatial or acoustic relationship to any sound event as a sound-source, and secondly because the act of listening is a psychological rather than a physiological process that imposes figure/ground relations. Acoustic space—as the space of intersubjectivity between the speaker and the audience in conditions of primary o/aurality—is what is (re)constructed in any sound recording as both a reproduction of a speech event and a representation of the act of listening.

Roland Barthes first separated hearing as a physiological phenomenon from listening as a psychological act that involves actively attending to certain material sounds and ignoring others. He identified three types of listening. The first of these involves what he termed an "animal" listening. This kind of listening is used for orienting oneself in relation to the proximity of possible threats and in relation to others; fundamentally, it is a form of aural spatialization or aural territoriality. The second form of listening involves the deciphering or interpreting of human language. This form of listening involves attending to the linguistic code as a symbolic system; as such, it involves what Barthes terms a kind of "oral hermeneutics" or the oral decoding of spoken linguistic signs. In contrast, the third form of listening involves listening to the "corporality of speech" and to the voice as "the articulation of body and discourse" (255). According to Barthes, this form of listening is an intersubjective space in which a "back and forth movement" between language as an abstract symbolic system and the body is made (255). This "back and forth" is the transformative space of intersubjectivity as a space in which linguistic identity—or subjectivity—is produced, consumed and exchanged.

Quoting Denis Vasse, Barthes argues:

> To listen to someone, to hear his voice, requires on the listener's part an attention open to the interspace of body and discourse and which contracts neither at the impression of the voice nor at the expression of the discourse. What such listening offers is precisely what the speaking subject does not say: the unconscious texture which associates his body-

> as-site with his discourse: an active textuality which reactualizes, in the subject's speech, the totality of his history. (255)

Intersubjective listening, then, involves listening to the body itself speaking and a kind of (unconscious) exchange of embodied linguistic subjectivity. Barthes framed this intersubjective listening not in terms of primary o/aurality but most often in terms of psychoanalysis, avant-garde art, or technologies of interpersonal voice transmission such as the telephone. It would appear that the apperception of the back and forth of listening as the unconscious space intersubjectivity requires or is facilitated by an act of mediation. However, unidirectional secondary orality is also clearly a mass mediated supplement to this transformative space of intersubjective listening. One-way secondary or technologized orality facilitates so-called vocal inscription rather than intersubjective dialogue and exchange. Read as such, the mediated voice becomes a technology of vocal inscription and the body of the passive auditor the medium that is inscribed.

This is of particular relevance to the reading of poetry because reading poetry stored in phonetic code also involves a form of intersubjective listening. This is because the act of silently reading poetry involves the act of sub-vocalization in Garrett Stewart's terms. Poetry in and of itself is a medium in which the "back and forth" of intersubjectivity is realized—typically in the process of being read or subvocalized from the printed page. Reading is intersubjective, then, because it involves the interplay between the disposition of the written text and that of the reader's own voice, sub-vocalizing as it reads; reading in this sense is also listening. It is not only a text but also an (dis)embodied form of linguistic subjectivity that is produced or reproduced in any spoken word *read text* recording.

Another way of understanding the Caedmon "sound-signature" as a supplement to authorial performance is through the school of apparatus criticism that has been elaborated in Film Studies. In "Is Sound Recording Like a Language?" Alan Williams argues that sound recording is a "signifying practice with effects, ideological and otherwise, comparable to those of [the] camera and projector" rather than a literal replica or reproduction of the real (51). Essentially, Williams argues that recorded sounds share properties with recorded images. As he notes: "All manipulations in film have analogs in sound" (59). The sound figuration enabled by the microphone effectively functions as sonic analog to the visual operations of the film camera. As Williams notes: "A microphone placed close to a sound source will produce a signal that makes the perceived source heard in the recording seem analogously close" (59). Conversely: "A more distant position not only lowers perceived volume but also includes proportionately more room acoustics, giving a more distant placement of the implied listener vis-à-vis the source" (59). A sound recording entails not only a recording of (dis)embodied language but also a social and environmental context.

Williams suggests that like the camera the microphone "gives an implied physical perspective on image or sound source" but that instead of "the full material context of everyday vision or hearing" it offers "the signs of such physical situation" (58). Williams suggests that this simulated relationship involves the construction of a surrogate listening subjectivity, which is at once "spatio-psychological" and ideological. After Jean-Louis Beaudry, he argues that similarly to the movements and placement of the camera, the movement and placement of the microphone function to synthesize "the world for entity" or a "transcendental listening subject" (56). Essentially, it is through the sound recording process that the construction of the "subject that listens" is achieved. The construction of a surrogate listening facility, then, occurs in the technical and aesthetic choices that are involved in making a sound recording as figuration or representation of a live speech event.

A key aspect of sound recording as the production of a listening subject is the inaudibility of the sound recording apparatus, which Williams suggests results in "good sound." "Good sound" involves the manipulation of the signal-to-noise ratio, or the relationship between sound figure and sonic ground, as the result of aesthetic and technical decisions on the part of the sound engineer. This sound figuration practice is not audible on the final product. According to Williams:

> Good sound is inaudible—which is to say we hear without attending consciously to what allows us to hear. The importance of this situation is twofold: (1) the "inaudibility" of good sound work, like the "invisibility" of the image track in classic narrative film, is largely the product of convention and not of fixed laws (though both have some necessary basis, certainly, in physiology and the psychology of perception), and (2)

> "inaudibility," like "invisibility," is only possible as the correlate of an implied subject that actively perceives, whose demands we accept as our own. (61)

Good sound is ideological to the degree that it privileges one sound among many (62). At its most basic level, it privileges the linguistic code and eliminates noise. This elimination of noise gratifies the desire of auditors, who are freed from the obligation to differentiate between different kinds of sounds as they do in conditions of primary aurality. As Williams frames this value specifically in relation to film sound tracks, it is precisely the audience's desire to eliminate noise from listening that is gratified by good sound. As Williams notes: "As with image recording, 'good' sound recording rewards suspension of disbelief with a perceptual fantasy, the attention that can remodel the world according to its demands" (63).

In describing "discursive" mass culture film sound, Williams is effectively outlining a reified modern sound recording aesthetic that developed as part of the modern mass culture industry during the 1920s and 1930s. Film sound and sense-differentiated sound reproduction are different in ways that relate to the differences between aural space and visual space and to the historicity of sound recording values within the sense-differentiated field of sound recording. Sound recording is much more complex than the techniques of microphone placement that Williams outlines, in ways that relate to the disposition of different media cultures (film voice is not radio voice is not audiotape voice) as well as fundamental distinctions between what I call modern and postmodern sound in the sense-differentiated field of sound recording.

As noted in Chapter One, sound is the product of sound waves reverberating within a particular enclosed space or acoustical environment. The properties of this acoustical environment shape the formal qualities of any speech-event that is recorded in a primary performance context and subsequently played back or reproduced in a secondary performance context. The same voice sounds very different when recorded in different acoustical environments. This is because the acoustical properties of particular acoustic contexts constitute the *reverberant field* in which a speech and sound event occurs. This reverberant field is the result of the size of a particular room and of the absorption co-efficient of various reflective surfaces throughout that room. Together, these shape the reverberation time or the decay time of various sound-events as well as what are termed its "subjective attributes." These attributes constitute the "sound-signature" of particular acoustical environments as live or primary performance venues. The main difference between modern partial sound spectrum recording and postmodern full sound spectrum recording is that these reverberant fields could be recorded and reproduced for the first time. This allowed for a lifelike simulation of a primary speech or sound-event in a secondary or playback context.

Sound engineer John Eargle notes that subjective attributes of any contained acoustic environment consist of *intimacy, liveness* and *warmth* (48-50). According to Eargle, *intimacy* "implies closeness of the listener to a performing group, and results from an ensemble of early reflections which follow closely on the direct sound by no more than 15-20 milliseconds" (48). Intimacy is clearly tied to the size of a room in which a speech or sound-event is recorded. The second subjective acoustical attribute is *liveness*. As Eargle describes it, *liveness* "implies a relatively high amount of reverberation in the mid-frequency range along with initial delay patterns characteristic of not-too-large rooms" (48-9). In contrast, *warmth* "is associated with high reverberation time at low frequencies" (49). While liveness involves the boosting of high-frequency sounds, warmth is the product of an acoustical environment that amplifies lower frequency sounds. Sound recording studios as a manifestation of "modern" sound values are typically non-reverberant or "dead." They aim to eliminate the characteristic subjective attributes that condition the reverberation of sound-events within particular acoustic environments. This minimum reverb is characteristic of a sound event that takes place in an extremely small acoustic environment. *Liveness* and *warmth* are supplemental attributes that may be added to condition the sound that is produced in any particular sound studio. These attributes are associated with primary acoustic environments, including live performance venues.

In general, Caedmon's sound signature was characteristically *intimate* in that it involved small room recording at Steinway Hall and in poets' own homes. This intimacy was not self-identical with the intimacy of the typical studio recording, however. Caedmon's sound-signature was also characteristically highly reverberant, or *warm*. To some degree this reverberant sound-signature was a function of the acoustics of Steinway Hall, which were simulated on subsequent Caedmon recordings. Caedmon's sound signature was not characterized by *liveness*, then, but by the boosting of lower frequency warm sounds through the choice of recording environments with particular acoustic attributes. This sound was highly distinctive in relation to the sound-signatures of other recording companies in synchronic terms. However, it was also diachronically distinctive with reference to the larger history of sound recording to the degree that it supplemented a non-reverberant sound that was characteristically "modern."

As outlined by Emily Thompson in *The Soundscape of Modernity*, the physical characteristics of sound changed in the 1920s as the result of changes in the acoustical design of public space, which were shaped by the introduction of modern electro-acoustically mediated sound into the modern mass culture industry. A characteristically modern sound was the product of radio and film sound and of the second wave of sound of sound recording. This characteristic non-reverberant modern sound was mimicked and universalized through techniques of architectural design in public spaces across America including performance halls but also modern office buildings. In material terms, modern sound was the result of the use of sound-absorbent materials in the construction of sound studios, and in public spaces, and the use of electro-acoustically mediated technologies of voice and sound extension. The tinny, highly artificial and dead or non-reverberant reified public sound-culture that is described by Thompson as the "soundscape of modernity" was typical of both the mass culture industry and of the architectural acoustics during the 1920s, 1930s, and 1940s.

In turn, the context-free "dead" sound of the mass culture industries of the 1920s was influenced by origins of sound recording, sound reproduction and sound amplification devices in the telephone industry. As outlined in Chapter One, the disposition of the sound recording industry during the second wave of post-alphabetical media was also influenced by the manipulation of the sound signal in electrical form. Sound recording engineers—including those who designed the first electrical sound recording systems—termed this manipulation of the sound signal "studio romanticism." The canned and context-free sound of the electrical era "modern" gramophone recording was not merely a phenomenon of the era of partial sound spectrum recording, it was also the product of a certain manipulation of the sound signal to produce a characteristic "modern" sound.

In contrast, third wave postwar sound recording was characterized by a shift to so-called "realistic" reproduction of an original sound-event as part of the cult of "high fidelity" sound reproduction.[1] Full sound spectrum recording enabled the fullness of a speech or sound-event, as it reverberated within a particular acoustical context, to be recorded for the first time. While this sound recording aesthetic was most often referred to as "life-like" sound reproduction, it was in effect a kind of "sonic realism" that opposed the sonic "techno-romanticism" of the late 1920s and early 1930s. In rejecting modern studio sound, Caedmon was rejecting the context-free sound of the mass culture industry during the second wave of mass media. In its place, Caedmon was proposing a postmodern sound—one that accentuated the linguistic signal as part of the postwar cult of high fidelity sound reproduction—but which at the same time made room for the sonic ground involved in the performance of a speech or sound event reverberating in a primary acoustic context. Postmodern sound involved the recording of a verbal or musical performance in a closed primary performance context and the reproduction of that sound-event as part of the phenomenon best seen as the symphony hall or lecture hall "without walls." As a form of sonic simulation, this recording value exemplified the discourse on extending culture to the so-called "common man" as the content of mass culture technologies. In sum, it was not only a technical and aesthetic value but also an ideological one.

Postmodern mass culture differed from modern mass culture not only in the techno-material values that were brought to bear upon its production but more fundamentally in its content. Caedmon was founded to broadly disseminate—and make permanent—the public poetry reading as a mid-twentieth century spoken word performance genre. This cultural phenomenon, which was best exemplified by Dylan Thomas, was part of a larger shift in the publication of poetry from written to spoken performance. Read and spoken public reading became discursive in the British context as part of an anti-fascist cultural politics during the war and immediately beforehand, which consolidated most notably in the form of BBC paraliterary spoken word programming after the war. That programming re-materialized as a live spoken word performance genre on the postwar poetry and lecture circuit in America as a country that did not have a state communicative apparatus that disseminated that spoken word genre electronically (at least within the continental United States). Public reading effectively became a form of spoken word "discursivity" at the mid-century as a result of these influences and others.

The politicization of reading underwrote the production of *read* and *spoken* texts as supplements to written texts, and later of *spoken* and *sonic compositions* or sound-art as a form of sonic and spoken word anti-discursivity, in both primary and secondary or mass-mediated aspects. At the same time, it is important to differentiate between several different kinds of poetry readings as these have been preserved in the vinyl archive. In general, the formal features of a poet's spoken word performance appear to be constrained by the historicity of primary spoken word performance genres; secondarily, they appear to be determined by the performance venue in which that speech-event is undertaken. Poets' readings clearly vary from performance context to performance context, particularly with regard to the degree to which poets stylize the spoken word; poetic language is radically stylized in front of an audience of peers to a degree that it is not stylized in front of general audiences. One can read this stylization synchronically in relation to the performance culture of poetry as a form of spoken word publication at any given historical moment. In a Bourdieian framework, the field of spoken word publication as a paraliterary field of cultural production has both restricted modalities, in which a spoken word performance is made for an audience of fellow producers or fellow poets, and large-scale modalities in which paraliterary performance constitutes spoken word publication before mass audiences.

One can also read this degree of stylization diachronically in that there is a continuum over time between the performances of emergent forms of poetry, as published before an audience of peers, and the consolidation of consecrated universal culture before general audience. This distinction is particularly relevant in relation to the performance cultures of the first and second "faces" of modernist paraliterary performance culture. The performances of modernist poets before audiences of peers in the restricted field, at bookstores such the Poetry Shoppe, Shakespeare & Company, or the Sun Wyse Turn, during the teens and early 1920s cannot be compared to the readings as large-scale public events in the postwar era, such as T.S. Eliot's 1953 reading at the University of Minnesota at Minneapolis, in which the poet read to a live audience of

13,000 at a football stadium, or his 1946 reading on the NBC *University of the Air* program.

Charles Bernstein has suggested a fundamental distinction between public poetry readings that corresponds to the Bourdieuian model of cultural production. Bernstein describes two different kinds of poetry readings: one of these is essentially monological and is made as part of the process of disseminating or publishing poetry before an unknown audience or public. The other type of reading involves a process whereby poetry is "constituted dialogically through recognition and exchange with an audience of peers" (23). In effect, Bernstein outlines a communicative context in the former type of public reading in which transmission is one-way. As Régis Debray has noted, there is effectively very little difference between a university lecture or reading, and electronic mass transmission; both are in some sense monological. Elaborating upon this point in Bourdieu's terms, one might suggest that both are made as part of the process of publishing legitimate or "universal" culture before audiences of non-peers, whether that audience consists of university students and the professorate in closed academic contexts or a general public attuned to electronic cultural programming as a form of mass education.

Despite certain homologies between live and broadcast transmissions of the literary word, it is important to acknowledge a difference between live performance venues and performance venues designed for the electronic dissemination of paraliterary culture via technologies of secondary orality. In addition to particular institutional sound production values, performances of poetry on state radio and television networks are subject to official style guides as "speech regimes." These codes supplement similar regimes that are part of spoken word performance in primary performance venues; among other examples, they include the slow tempo of the Basic English favored by the Voice of America network or the Received Pronunciation English once favored by the BBC. Public speech regimes have left traces on the public voice documents of the poetry archive of the LP era in ways that supplement the sound-signatures of particular recorders and the dispositions of various forms of sound recording media. When performing on state broadcasting networks, for example, poets appear to have consciously or unconsciously modified their performances to suit these style guides. The voice of Dylan

Thomas is muted, intimate, speech-like, and markedly British in disposition in the radio talks that introduce his performance of several of his works on the BBC; these codes of performance would appear to have been shaped by the BBC's style guides and by the radio talk and the reading of verse as secondary or technologized spoken word genres. In contrast, Thomas' live performances in American settings were characterized by a loud and declamatory style that was clearly shaped by codes of dramatic "public speech" as shaped by conditions of primary orality.

The voice documents of the poetry archive reveal that the *private/public* distinction is also relevant with reference to the formal features of any spoken word performance. Intimate private readings exhibit different features than public readings. Private readings are made in front of a small circle of physically approximate and socially intimate auditors. They exhibit considerably less bodily amplitude than public readings given the physical proximity between speaker and audience. They also involve the performance of the spoken word in the "private speech" modulation rather than the public performance the declaimed "public speech" modulation. The private/public distinction is highly relevant when distinguishing the stylistic features of particular performances as preserved in the spoken word archive. One example is the differences between Dylan Thomas' drunken and subdued performance private-context performance on the Side Two of *Dylan Thomas Volume 3* and his much more vibrant and declamatory public-context performance at MIT on *Side One* of that album.[2]

The private/public distinction is also relevant when considering a disjunction between written memoirs about the performance culture of the first face of modernism and the more public second face of modernism, particularly as this relates to key figures who were active in both eras. As Virginia Woolf described T.S. Eliot's private 1922 performance of *The Waste Land* as a work in progress at Hogarth House in her diary the poet "sang it & chanted it rhythmed it" (Lee 443). (In effect, Woolf reported that Eliot performed his poem as a *spoken composition.*) Woolf's account of Eliot's highly stylized performance is very different from the style in which Eliot performed the poem publicly as a *read text* as this was recorded from the 1930s onward by various institutional and commercial recorders. Eliot's "eerily depersonalized vocal style" as described by Bernstein can also be interpreted as a radical refusal of orality (12). (In its own technomaterial context, that style can also be read as a form of anti-discursivity.) In effect, in these latter *read text* readings Eliot emphasized the text in sound-text. Rather than reading each of Eliot's performances essentially, however, one might suggest that these performances were institutionally and historically determined by the primary performance contexts in which they were undertaken as much if not more than they were by Eliot's actual age. In sum, different kinds of performance contexts and different kinds of historically specific spoken word genres tend to invoke different performance regimes or codes of performance and therefore different kinds of performances. For this reason alone, a poet's sounded or embodied performance of a text that is completely reified in the printed or visual modality is necessary multiple in the vocal modality.

Spoken word documents are a product of a poet's voice practice as a technique of vocal stylization, of a sound recording practice that is the result of a sound recording engineer's aesthetic and technical choices, and finally of the disposition of a sound recording medium at a particular point in time. When listening to a document such as the *Caedmon Treasury of Modern Poets Reading* or *Dylan Thomas Reading His Complete Poetry,* one hears not only each poet's voice practice as modulated on a particular occasion of performing the poem but also the sound signature or sound figuration practice of the recorder who made the recording and the disposition of the medium in which the performance was recorded. For all of these reasons, one cannot essentialize any single performance by a poet purely in terms of his or her stylistic or formal choices.

It is essential to consider Eliot's "eerily depersonalized vocal style" as recorded in his performance of *The Waste Land* not only the product of his voice practice but also as a material manifestation of late electrical era "gramophone voice" as a remnant of modern sound recording values; Eliot's performance is not self-identical with his much warmer and more baritone reading on his Caemon LP *T.S. Eliot Reading Poems and Choruses*, for example. Similarly, when Bernstein suggests that "the unanticipably [sic] slow tempo of Wallace Stevens's performance tells us much about his sense of the poem's rhythms and philosophical seriousness," it seems relevant to query if Stevens was conforming to the codes of academic decorum and education-speak that generally govern the performance of poetry in educational contexts as a live cultural transmission, including his recorded live reading at Harvard, or whether Stevens' voice-practice might not reveal the exigencies of educational broadcasting on the WGBH Amherst/Boston educational radio station, or even the characteristically slow tempo of the VOA's "Basic English" broadcast style. In sum, it is necessary to query the provenance of the public voice documents of the national poetry archive.

One might suggest in very general terms that the "tranquilized" and "stately" tempo of postwar poetry in public performance was a kind of highly historical performance regime that conditioned the second face of modernism. To my ear, the tranquilized aesthetic of 1950s poetry as preserved in media of secondary orality is the product of heterogeneous sound signatures of various educational broadcasters, which often broadcast tape-recorded readings that were undertaken at educational institutions, as reproduced and/or mimicked in the LP medium during the monaural era. This tranquilized aesthetic was part of the translation of modernist poetry from the printed to the sounded modality during the LP moment. This historical sound-signature is also part of the educational disposition of postwar educational radio as the scene of the postmodern. This disposition is in evidence in voice documents harvested from live performances in educational settings or educational broadcasts, but it is also in evidence in Caedmon's "first edition" voice documents. In contrast to second wave spoken word recordings, which had a disposition that was shaped by the mass culture industry, the disposition of third wave postmodern sound was fundamentally educational.

The historicity of the Caedmon sound signature on Caedmon's "first edition" LPs also reflected certain sound recording and sound reproduction values that were part of the postwar cult of high fidelity or the "lifelike" reproduction of a sound or speech event. In general, one might refer to sound recording and sound reproduction values in terms of a sonic realism that involves a life-like recording that reproduces a sound-event resonating in a particular acoustic context that includes both sound figures and their ground. The microphone privileges the former in reproductions of a speech or sound-event but does not eliminate the latter entirely. This reverberant recording of a sound or speech event resonating in a primary acoustic context, and its reproduction in a secondary performance context, might be said to entail something like "the soundscape of postmodernity" in that it involved the reproduction of a live cultural event in a closed performance context as part of the postwar "opening of the field" of culture to mass audiences.

Peter Bartók was clearly an exemplar of sonic realism as a both a technical value and a sound recording aesthetic. Bartók was also an articulate spokesperson for the technical and aesthetic values that lay behind lifelike sound reproduction. In an article written for *The Nation* and published on December 4 1954, Bartók defined high fidelity as "the faithful reproduction of a certain original sound" (485). Bartók also memorably defined good sound and good sound reproduction in terms of its effect on the listener. As he argued: "If the effect on the listener of a loudspeaker-produced sound is the same as it would be from a 'live performed' sound in a suitable auditorium with proper acoustics, then let us call the reproduction good" (485). Conversely, as Bartók suggested: "Any deviation in the sound characteristics due to acoustical conditions, in the time-relationship of the various sound components to each other, in their intensity relationship, in the components that are present, makes for bad reproduction" (485). The distortions that Bartók's article discussed were the result of the sound recording and record mastering process. Eliminating these distortions produced a "life-like" or realistic reproduction. The discourse of life-like reproduction was key value in the postwar audio engineering industry, particularly as this related to the reproduction of classical music as the content of the third wave of voice and sound mass media. For my purposes, Bartók's sound reproduction aesthetic can be defined as studio realism.

The opposite of studio realism might be termed studio romanticism as a form of distorting sound figuration that involves the manipulation of an electrical sound signal through the addition of reverb, for example. This manipulation was not limited to aesthetic elements. As Bartók noted, it also had what he termed a "psychological effect." To some extent, studio romanticism can also be seen as a "technological romance" that produces particular forms of affect. A third sound recording value is sonic idealism. Fundamentally, sonic idealism involves a change between figure and ground and typically a very high signal-to-noise ratio. It is not self-identical with the cult of high fidelity because it involved the editing of a so-called "original" sound event to eliminate noise and privilege sound signs or sound signals.

The discourse of high fidelity was typically evoked in the classical recording industry in ways that are not entirely homologous to spoken word recording. A "high fidelity" spoken word sound production aesthetic involved the privileging of linguistic sounds and the elimination of non-linguistic noise. At its fullest expression, this form of sound figuration involved a form of sonic idealism that relied not only on microphone placement and the choice of a particular acoustic environment to record in but also a comprehensive editing of an original speech event. This value is also part of the distinctive Caedmon "sound signature" but it is one that developed over time. Caedmon's earliest voice documents reflected Bartók's value of sonic realism in that they were not highly edited.

Caedmon's sound recording and sound reproduction value came to reflect the value that I call sonic idealism only as Mantell slowly assumed sound recording and sound editing functions. To my ear, this sound production value is a material manifestation of neo-humanism, or the discourse of the postwar humanities, in its sense-differentiated audio modality. It cannot be understood purely as a form of sonic realism, or a material manifestation of the cult of high fidelity. Bartók shaped Caedmon's sound recording aesthetic initially. The centrality of Bartók in the early Caedmon enterprise cannot be over-estimated. As a sound recording engineer, he tutored both of Caedmon's founders in sound recording techniques. As Holdridge recalls: "Peter, of course, was a master of recording and got exactly the right sound. I think he is instrumental in getting the right tone—in the sound of Caedmon—from the beginning." As Holdridge elaborates: "He definitely had a role in shaping Caedmon's sound at the beginning. We learned how to do it and we adhered to that. From then on, at whatever studio or hall we used, we maintained that sound. At that point, we knew what we wanted. What we wanted was what Peter had set up for us."

Caedmon's founders were extraordinarily careful in obtaining a similar sound in each Caedmon record by paying attention to each element of the sound recording process. Caedmon clearly manipulated the acoustic properties of the *reverberant field* in which they recorded in that they almost always recorded in small room settings that were likely to provide *intimate* and *warm* voice documents. As Holdridge frames the Caedmon sound: "We wanted a room sound, an intimate sound, of someone in the same room reading to you, rather than the hall sound in which you had a big expansive echo." As she elaborates: "Now we didn't rule out echo entirely. There had to be the fullness of a room sound. It couldn't be a dead sound. We did not want a dead studio sound." As defined by Holdridge: "A dead studio sound is one in which there is no reverberation—in which there's no fullness of a person with air and space between himself and the listener—but not the reverberation of a hall."

In essence, Holdridge is outlining a simulation of a small room or intimate setting with a natural amount of echo or reverberation that was appropriate to that setting. In technical terms, the dead or canned studio sound that Holdridge is alluding to is characterized by very low reverberation. Live performance halls, in contrast, tend to be highly reverberant. Caedmon was searching for a middle ground between these two types of sound. It initially found that middle ground in Steinway Hall or Carnegie Hall B as a small recital hall. The intimate and highly reverberant acoustics of Steinway Hall, or the "sound signature" of that particular live performance venue effectively unified the early voice documents that Caedmon published as part of its wider catalogue, including the recordings of Dylan Thomas, the Sitwells, e.e. cummings, Marianne Moore, W.H. Auden, and William Faulkner among others. Those acoustics effectively became Caedmon's own "sound signature," which was mimicked on subsequent voice documents.

However, as Bartók recalls: "Only the beginning sessions were done in concert halls with plenty of reverberation." This arose in part because of Bartók's conflict with Steinway Hall over violating the terms of his lease by using brass instruments in the classical music sessions that he also recorded there. Bartók subsequently undertook to make recordings for Caedmon at makeshift sound studios in the New York area including churches and libraries. He used the auditorium of the Washington Irving High School in Manhattan for a number of Caedmon recordings, in particular. One of these recordings, that of Stephen Spender, perhaps best exemplifies a certain high fifties highly reverberant sound recording aesthetic. The use of the school auditorium as a performance venue designed for the live transmission of the spoken word is particularly salient given the educational disposition of spoken word sound recording and the political morality that underwrote the postwar appropriation of technologies of mass communication and post-alphabetical mass media in the service of mass education.

A "close listening" to Spender's performance also reveals different codes at work in disseminating poetry as public speech via technologies of secondary orality in the

British and the American contexts. On the one hand, Spender was clearly performing the hyper-articulated public school Received Pronunciation English favored by the BBC and by British educators. However, he was also doing so in the declamatory or public speech modality—and in a highly reverberant field—in ways that are very different from the highly intimate and context-free sound signature favored by the BBC. This highly reverberant sound signature reflects the value of "live" performance as simulated on Caedmon's sound recordings. It is both American and postmodern.

Even as Caedmon produced a distinctively postmodern form of "public speech" and rejected the technically simulated intimacy produced by a recording studio, many of Caedmon's voice documents were also intimate, albeit in a different way than the radio-influenced disposition of spoken word recordings as produced by other recorders. This intimacy was not technically simulated but was instead a function of Caedmon's attempts to get to know writers, which colored the modulations of these writer's adddresses to Holdridge, Mantell, and Bartók as proxies for Caedmon's unseen mass audiences. Mantell suggests that this intimacy was partially a function of Caedmon's attempts to get to know writers well beforehand, which allowed writers to relax somewhat. Warming up poets and writers was an essential aspect of the preamble to the recording session because Holdridge and Mantell were after a naturalistic and relaxed reading that was ideally almost semi-private in terms of its vocal modulations.

Mantell suggests that three elements were required for a good raw recording: a good acoustic environment, that writers were relaxed, and that Caedmon experiment with the placement of mikes. The choice of a unidirectional or omni-directional microphone was particularly important. Almost fifty years after she recorded Faulkner, for example, Mantell remembers that she had to send out for the right kind of microphone in order to record him. Faulkner was a difficult personality to record. However, as Mantell recalls: "Part of it was technical because Faulkner walked around for many years with a pipe in his mouth. So he didn't speak very clearly. The sound came out here, where the pipe wasn't [gestures to the side of her mouth]. So we sent out quickly for an Altec mike." Essentially, voice recording equipment and microphones had to be chosen and placed to suit the vocal characteristics of each speaker.

Holdridge maintains that part of the distinctively intimate Caedmon sound involved each writer's address to herself and Mantell. As she insists: "They *were* reading to us. They were not reading to the great, unwashed masses. They were reading to Marianne and Barbara, whom they knew and they trusted and perhaps liked—but *responded* to." From Holdridge's point of view, the age, gender and educational background of Caedmon's founders was a factor that set a certain tone. As she argues: "I don't believe that there was anyone that didn't feel he was reading to two women who cared. That was very different than any other recording, including Lieberson's [of Columbia Records]. Because he may have been there, physically, but first of all he was a man, and that *does* make a difference. He was an executive type. We were not executive types. We were girls in our twenties at the time." Bartók also established this informal atmosphere. As Holdridge recalls, speaking again of the contrast between the Columbia and the Caedmon recording experience: "He [Lieberson] would have had very polished engineers, very professional engineers, doing the recording. Peter was as professional as they came, but polished—no." As Holdridge describes Bartók's contribution to the recording sessions: "He was an individual, and a very caring individual, and certainly different from studio engineers. He was an artist in his own way."

As part of the process of producing the distinctive Caedmon sound, the record company offered to record wherever writers felt comfortable. When not undertaken in New York, many sessions undertaken at writers' own homes. As Bartok recalls: "We did not need fancy acoustics as long as the voice was recorded in a quiet environment." Writers tended to adopt a less public and more private speech style in these intimate "small room" settings. Writers' homes often produced a characteristically warm sound-signature—particularly as most appear to have been constructed from naturally reverberant wood. When poets were recorded in rural settings, there are no discernable extraneous sounds on the voice documents that Caedmon subsequently published as the surrounding soundscape was not picked up by the recording apparatus. T.S. Eliot's office at Faber and Faber was also remarkably free of extraneous noises that would make similar recordings in any urban environment impossible now. However, in the case of William Carlos Williams, who was recorded at his home at the relatively suburban East

Rutherford, there was considerable interference from background noise in the form of surrounding traffic, which is audible on the finished voice document.

Caedmon's recording and sound editing values seem to have been consciously articulated in producing the Sean O'Casey LP. The raw recording for this recording was undertaken by Bartók in O'Casey's rustic home in Totness, Devon in November 1952. This recording was particularly interesting because a certain breach between what I call Bartók's sonic realism and Mantell's sonic idealism took shape as a result of the editing that was required to produce an LP from this raw recording. O'Casey's home was devoid of central heating; as a consequence, a fire continually crackled in the background. Bartók determined to avoid reproducing the sound of the nearby generator that was required for the purposes of making the recording but thought that the sounds of the fire would lend ambience to the record. As he recalls: "Although the fireplace and the crackling of the wood presented a nice atmosphere when I was making the record, and I thought it would lend a nice atmosphere to the finished record, all the little crackling sounds that came up on the original records had to be edited out afterward because they sounded like clicks on the vinyl disc." In contrast, the more romantic sound of a distant train whistle—which according to the liner notes "lent its harmonious note" to O'Casey's "lovely prose"—was allowed to remain. In effect, Caedmon would attempt to record and reproduce the small room intimacy of original recording contexts while simultaneously removing the acoustic sound-signatures that were particular to those contexts. In such a manner, Caedmon was able to simulate a universal or non-context specific reproduction of an original sound and speech event.

Bartók helped to establish Caedmon's sound recording aesthetic but he also tutored Mantell in sound editing as the next step in the process of producing a spoken word recording. As the first step in that process, Bartók notes the necessity of making the right number of takes: "I very much disliked recording something only once since if some damage happens to one recording, it is nice to know that there is another one. And also people make mistakes. People hesitate. They cough. They mispronounce a word. They repeat something." Multiple takes were required in order to compensate for errors. As Bartók recalls: "At least two recordings were desirable, and I tried to get that." As Bartók describes the editing process: "Sometimes, we edited together one sentence from here and the next sentence, which had a cough in the middle of it, from another." However, there were also dangers in recording any passage too many times. As Bartók explains: "In becoming more and more perfect they become relaxed and the reading character loses its spontaneity. There is a point where boredom takes over and has a greater effect on the performance than the practice that is incurred in the repeated performances." Bartók was after a naturalistic and spontaneous reading as a raw performance. "Perfection" was achieved only in the editing process, as a single perfect performance was derived from the splicing together of at least two performances.

Neither Mantell nor Holdridge recalls when Bartók stopped editing for Caedmon but gradually Mantell began to assume editing duties. Mantell remembers taking these over little by little "when we went away [or] when we couldn't afford it." As Mantell recounts this transition: "What happened was that we couldn't afford to pay Peter. Peter showed me how to edit. My father was an engineer. I would hear when something sounded good." Taking over sound editing or tape mastering allowed Caedmon to cut back significantly on costs. Tape mastering was a time-consuming and expensive process. Whereas undertaking a raw recording took only two to three hours, editing a finished master tape could take literally hundreds of hours.

Mantell recalls the time-consuming process of editing raw audiotape in order to make a master tape on a tape-editing machine as follows: "There used to be a little steel bar with a groove in the width of the tape and a diagonal across it. And if you're smart, you'd listen to the tape, and at the point at which you want to make a mark, you open the door of the part of the machine, and the tape is running through, and you mark a china dot on the spot." According to Mantell: "You make a dot and then you go to—if it's a short thing, then you make the next dot. You put the tape on [and] you make a slash mark though the little steel bar, and a slash through the second dot. And you line up the two things in this groove, which is exactly the width of the tape, and you put a piece of tape, which is the width of the tape—a specific tape made for editing, a special product intended for this." In this process, unwanted sounds were removed from the raw recording. The same technique was used for longer edits. As Mantell recalls: "If it's a longer section that you want to cut out, you make a cut and you run the tape on until you get to where you're going. You run it onto the floor, and then you stop near where you want to go and make a cut and line up the two ends."

One of Mantell's greatest achievements as an editor in the monaural era involved the production of *William Carlos Williams Reads His Poetry*. The raw tape required intensive editing because of Williams' recent series of strokes. As a result, Mantell had to reconstruct the rhythms and cadences of the poet's spoken line. She proceeded to edit the raw audiotape recording of Williams' halting reading based on her intuition of what "sounded right." An authority no less than that of the poet's own cardiologist later validated her sound sense, however. As Mantell recalls: "Years later [after the publication of the Williams' recording], I get a call from a guy who identifies himself as William Carlos Williams' cardiologist. He had just come across the recording and it sounded somewhat familiar. And he saw the date on the label and said, 'Wait a minute, he couldn't talk at that time!'" As Mantell reprises her narrative, the cardiologist remembered that: "He had recorded the sound of William Carlos Williams's electrocardiogram at the time he wrote the main poem [Paterson]. And he hooked up one of the sounds he heard on the record—and he couldn't understand how the rhythm was identical!" Mantell had unconsciously mimicked the rhythms of the poet's heartbeat. As she recalls somewhat incredulously: "I was simply going by what I thought drove the lines." Of sound editing in general, she avers: "It's intuition. You can't edit unless you get inside the material."

Mantell's skills as a sound editor were also particularly important in establishing the distinctive and heavily produced sound of the Shakespeare Recording Society series. Howard Sackler would often make as many as seventeen takes of a single scene. Mantell would then pick the best of these takes and splice it with elements drawn from the others. The SRS series in particular was clearly a product of an elaborate post-production process rather than a straightforward recording of a theatrical production (Much to Mantell's consternation, she was not able to teach Philips' engineers her own editing style.)

Editing styles are quite distinctive and those of Bartók and Mantell were not completely similar. Bartók's own sound recording and sound editing styles can be categorized as a kind of studio realism, whereas those of Mantell can ultimately be characterized as studio idealism. As Bartók notes: "I like to keep all the sounds that are involved in speaking, including even the background of the room, such as the fireplace, so as to have the most natural effect of someone in a finite environment talking. For example, if the breath taken before a line of a poem is read is deliberately edited out, it sounds unnatural. Everyone has to breathe who speaks because breathing involves the exhaling of the air from the lungs, which has to be replaced." In contrast, Mantell favored a very highly edited final product in which all non-linguistic bodily sounds were edited out, including breaths, pauses and the onsets and offsets of particular words. Her editing style produced relatively disembodied voiced texts. Bartók suggests that her sound editing aesthetic rather than his ultimately prevailed in the sound recording industry. As he notes: "Today, in CDs it seems to go without saying that all these extraneous sounds are taken out."

The third step in the production process involved the production of a master record. As Mantell recounts this process: "The edited tape is then played [in the mastering studio]. The sound signal is received by a stylus, which cuts the grooves into the master. The master is then plated. It is then put in a metal bath. What comes out is the mother."[3] The final step involved record pressing. As Mantell describes this process: "A record press is like a giant waffle maker. It has two flat plates. The bottom has a spindle on it. The labels are put on the spindle. A blob called a cookie of vinyl is put in the middle of this. A guy puts the top of the waffle maker down. There's a large hiss. The dough melts and spreads into the grooves. There's always a little vinyl around the edges and the operator will remove this with his hands. A very little bit, no one wants to waste this. [He] picks up the top and lifts off the record, puts in the next cookie, and keeps doing this."[4]

Pressing was a purely mechanical process but record mastering was not. Spoken word record mastering was effected by the same kinds technical difficulties that were involved in mastering musical records but it also involved one singular problem that was based on the economic necessity of squeezing as many minutes of reading time as possible onto each recording. This meant that record grooves had to be spaced very closely together and as a result, there was often a certain transfer from one groove to an adjacent groove. In Bartók's words, echoes or pre-echoes "of what has happened two seconds earlier or what is going to happen two seconds later" were sometimes clearly audible in the silences between words that are a part of spoken word records. Another reason for this echo and pre-echo arose when records were mastered during the summer months before the advent of air conditioning. As Bartók notes: "The lacquer discs of the master record would become soft in the heat. And if they became soft, before they were coated or electroplated with metal for the process to make the negatives from which records were pressed, they tended to relax their internal tensions. The lacquer and heat is when some of this transfer from one groove to another would take place due to the softness of the lacquer."[5]

Record mastering was viewed by most as a technical process but from Mantell's point of view, a certain amount of aesthetic discernment was also necessary. As she notes: "If you're recording a voice, the criterion is whether this sounds like Dylan Thomas. If you're recording a piano, it's whether that's what a piano sounds like, whether there's too much echo or too much base." As Mantell elaborates on the process of mastering a recording of Ibsen's *A Doll's House* in particular: "If Hedda Gabler is supposed to be playing piano in the next room and the sound is like a concert hall—echo—it takes someone who knows what it sounds like to say, 'Wait a minute!'" Mantell learned how supervise record mastering from Bartók. As she recounts: "I never asked Peter to explain the physics of sound to me. It was enough for me to find a sound that sounded right. At the time Peter knew what was right and what sounded good. This is what a violin sounds like."

Mantell's intuitive approach to the process of record mastering sometimes led to conflicts with the sound recording engineers whom she was paying to produce master records. The most salient example of this involved the last Dylan Thomas recording that Caedmon published before Mantell left the company. Caedmon obtained this recording from the BBC but when RCA sent back the test pressing it was clear that the pitch of Thomas' voice was too high. This was because the turntable was revolving at too slow a speed when the master was made. As a result, Thomas' voice played back too fast or too high. As Mantell recalls, the master "sounded like a human being but not the human being who was Dylan Thomas."

As Mantell recalls the subsequent conference in RCA's crowded mastering studio between the recording engineer, the editing engineer, and the technician who operated the variable speed oscillator: "There was not enough air to go around." Mantell used her gender to her advantage in this situation. Feigning a headache, she sent each of these men on separate errands for aspirin, a glass of water, and the like. When she was finally alone in the room, she put a chair against the door to prevent them from re-entering the studio and "held the tape under the flywheel," manually controlling the speed of the test pressing in order to slow it down. Then, as Mantell recalls: "When it sounded right, I made a copy." She then took the corrected master with her and had the record pressed elsewhere. Mantell justifies her decision on the grounds that it saved Caedmon time and money. She also suggests that the engineers at RCA's mastering plant would never have solved the problem because they did not have her sound sense. An ear for "realism, quality—an aesthetic decision, anyway" is what is required in order to produce a master record, Mantell suggests: "An engineer watching the oscilloscope has no interest in it. A, they don't know what Dylan Thomas sounded like. B, even if they had, it wouldn't have made a difference!"

Following the terms outlined by Williams, one might suggest that Caedmon's sound signature effectively negotiated a kind of middle ground between "bad" and "good" sound. The middle position becomes audible when one compares the characteristic Caedmon sound to that of rival record labels such as Folkways and Columbia. Folkways clearly exhibited "bad" sound reproduction values. In listening to Folkways' recordings of Langston Hughes, for example, one hears the turning on and off of the recording apparatus. Folkways' recordings also featured a maximum number of grooves per inch, which resulted in considerable bleeding between record grooves. As a result, aural echo and pre-echo were often discernable on Folkways' records. Furthermore, Folkways was not overly diligent about simulating a fixed point of audition in its spoken word recordings. The voice of Hughes was characterized by shifts in intensity and amplitude as it drifted in and out of range, as apparently mobile poet shifted his position in relation to the fixed position of the microphone. For this reason, the "sampling" or fixed sonic point of view that Williams describes is not consistent and the simulation of a fixed point in aural space, or spatio-psychological subjectivity that Williams outlines, is therefore not achieved. As a result, the audient cannot surrender to a surrogate listening facility. Instead, he or she remains aware of the fact that they are listening to a sound recording that is a reproduction of Hughes' voice.

In contrast, Columbia's spoken word recordings exhibit "good" sound recording values. Columbia's writer's recordings exhibit a particularly close microphone placement as a type of aural close-up. As a result of this microphone placement, poets appear to modulate their voices using codes of intimate or private speech: Moore whispers, Thomas croons softly. Alternatively, in the case of cummings and Auden, the secondary mass audience is addressed using codes of conversational but physically proximate speech. Perhaps because of this microphone placement, Columbia's spoken word recordings are generally made using codes of privately modulated speech rather than codes of declamation or public speech. Columbia's spoken word recordings are also markedly embodied. Goddard Lieberson's engineers do not appear to have favored the editing out of bodily sounds; one can hear signs of breath and the onsets and offsets of particular words, for example. These sound production techniques simulate the presence of an embodied oral intimate in close physical proximity. The Columbia sound-signature eliminates all other forms of noise, however. Instead, it privileges the linguistic code as the "essence" of a speech event. Columbia's sound ultimately functions to create conditions in which the audient completely surrenders to a surrogate listening facility.

Caedmon's sound signature is very different from Columbia's industry-standard sound signature. This is particularly evident when one compares the *Pleasure Dome* and the *Caedmon Treasury* anthologies, which contain recordings of many of the same poets. Caedmon's recordings generally featured a mid-range mike placement rather than Columbia's aural close up. As a result of Caedmon's mike placement, some of the aural context in which a recording was made seeped into the final record. At the very beginning of Caedmon's Auden recording, one faintly hears something like a hammering sound in the background; faint traffic sounds are also discernable at various points during his performance. The background noises of the New York primary soundscape as sonic ground are also faintly noticeable on the recording of e. e. cummings. (As an index of place, they are akin in some sense to the train whistle in the background of the O'Casey recording.) To some extent, these sounds resulted in a lower technical standard than Columbia's spoken word recordings. Perhaps a result of Caedmon's mid-range mike placement and the fact that Caedmon recorded in a recital hall, poets did not use codes of private speech or conversational speech when recording for Caedmon. Rather, they tended to favor a more declamatory public speech performance style. This public style is particularly in evidence on e. e. cummings' chanting performance and Auden's "god-like" declamation.

Caedmon's highly edited style also resulted in a much less embodied sound than on Columbia recordings, and a less breathy reading style in particular. This editing style clearly privileged the *text* in *sound-texts*. Arguably, Caedmon's high signal-to-noise ratio mimicked the black and white of the written word. This extremely distinctive sound was significant in the context of the larger shift from culture of reading to a culture of listening in that it offered a kind of audio analogue to the written word. At the same time, Caedmon's sound signature was distinctive within the broader context of postwar media shift in that it offered the highest signal-to-noise ratio in the wider "low-fidelity" postwar soundscape as characterized by the low-fidelity din of television in particular. (Effectively, this gave the poet's voice added clarity within that larger mediasphere.) In general, the Columbia and Caedmon sound signatures imitated different fields of media. Columbia's recordings were characterized by a "dead" studio sound that mimicked the disposition of "radio voice" in its intimate or post-fascist Arnheim-influenced aspect. In contrast, Caedmon captured a speech event reverberating in a live acoustic context rather than the radio voice of Columbia's spoken word recordings. This simulation of live performance was essentially a postmodern sound that attempted to universalize such performance in postmodern mass media. The latter sound also represented the soundscape of postmodernity as a performance-centered sound aesthetic.[6]

Finally, it is important to note that the tempo of Caedmon recordings is also comparatively slow in relation to those made by other record companies. This extra-deigetic element is also ideological and signifies an affinity with other secondary media cultures and with other primary spoken word performance cultures. This tempo is particularly audible when comparing the *Pleasure Dome* and *Caedmon Treasury* anthologies. Thomas and Auden's performances are much slower on Caedmon's anthology; cummings' performance in particular is oddly "tranquilized."[7] It is uncertain whether this tempo was a choice made by those who performed for the Caedmon or whether it was achieved afterwards in the tape mastering process. The tempo of that performance may have involved an unconscious choice of the part of each of the poets that Caedmon recorded. However, if so it was one that almost all made when recording for the label. This slow tranquilized tempo is also at the scene of the postmodern in that it evokes the tempo of "Basic English" in its audio modality, as the voice regime favored by the Voice of America network, and Basic English more generally as a reduced or simple form of English directed to both international audiences and the so-called "common man." This slow tempo also evokes educational public speech in live or primary transmission contexts. This "educational" sound signature is characteristic of the disposition of postmodern secondary or technologized speech during the monaural LP moment.[8] Postmodern sound, then, is highly edited and warm or reverberant; its disposition is also fundamentally educational.

To re-invoke a Derridean terminology—within an explicitly materialist and historicist framework—Caedmon's *read text* voice documents were clearly *supplements* to the printed literary text within the larger context of a postwar shift in media systems. However, both live poetry readings and spoken word recordings can be understood in another critical register as *paratexts* in ways that relate to the politicization of reading and the material dissemination of writing during the Cold War period. As defined on the flyleaf to Gérard Génette's book of the same title: "Paratexts are those liminal devices and conventions, both within and outside the book, that form part of the complex mediation between book, author, publisher, and reader." These include *peritexts* that are materially a part of the book, such as forewords and publisher's jacket copy, and *epitexts* which are materially separate from the text itself, such as printed and television interviews. Even as a spoken word recording can be taken for an epitextual paratext, I would like to suggest that a sound recording is also in some sense a sound-text in its own right in ways that are implicitly authorized by Genette himself, while simultaneously retaining the concept of a paratext to describe the material apparatus that conditioned the social circulation of *read text* LP recordings as supplements to the written text.[9]

Despite the essential distinction between paratexts and sound-texts as a supplement to the written text that I am imposing, the Genettian concept of the paratext is a useful framework for considering the ways in which the dissemination and consumption of the voice documents published by Caedmon was shaped by various forms of paratextual apparatus that were not unlike those that mediated the dissemination of the book. The consumption of *read text* and *spoken text* LPs as symbolic commodity-objects was mediated by various forms of public *epitexts*, including reviews in the middlebrow cultural periodicals and bulletins and papers issued by educational bodies among others, and by visual and verbal publisher's *peritexts* that were produced by Caedmon itself. In particular, Caedmon LPs were framed or by various liminal devices including the album cover as an analogue to the book cover, for example, and by the discursive or verbal apparatus that formed part of the LP on the dust jacket, which was analogous to both the dust jacket on hardcover books and also in some sense to the preface that proceeds a printed text.

Perhaps because of her background in art and her background at Liveright Corporation, Holdridge supervised much of the design of these covers, which essentially mediated between each poet's performance and the reception of that performance by mass or secondary audiences. Of these two peritextual modes, Caedmon's distinctive album cover art was arguably primary. As Holdridge recalls: "I loved doing these covers. You had a twelve by twelve canvas to work on. This was a major piece of art. It gave enough scope for really fine work." Some of New York's finest graphic designers produced album covers for Caedmon. One of the most memorable was Andy Warhol, whose day job at the time was designing show windows for the Andrew Geller Shoe Store. Warhol was one of many young artists who approached Caedmon with portfolios of their work. As Holdridge recalls drily: "I was not impressed by his portfolio—which had quite a few shoes in it—but we did assign him the *Tennessee Williams Reading* cover."

As with poets' and actors' performances that were directed by Holdridge and Mantell, the importance of individual creativity and style was paramount. As Holdridge recalls: "We chose them for their style. That was the first thing. And told them in general how we perceived the art and left them to their own devices." As preparation, Holdridge and Mantell told graphic artists to read the text or sometimes to listen to the recording for which they were designing the cover, in order to produce a visual image that was symbolic of the sound. In effect, the visual image produced through the artist's own subjective experience of the voiced performance that he or she had heard. This produced a very eclectic visual style that varied from album cover to album cover.

Like many others, Warhol's own cover featured a simple imitation woodcut design, which was the most typical type of Caedmon album cover art. The anachronistic quality of the simulated woodcut print was clearly in keeping with the Caedmon name as a simulated return to the pre-modern. In this sense, both the visual art of Caedmon covers and Caedmon's reverberant or pre-modern sound recording aesthetic were sense-differentiated analogues that reflected Andreas Huyssen's definition of the postmodern as a reworking of the legacy of the modernist art practice in way that involved a return to the premodern in conditions of modern mass culture production (as cited in Thompson 323-4). Holdridge suggests that the simulated woodcut print as etched into linoleum was both very expressive and "a way of doing a less expensive album cover." As she elaborates: "In those days, you didn't do those things photographically. You had to put overlays on the art one by one for the color and mask out the parts that were not that color. So it was a hand operation, and rather time-consuming. If you didn't do it right, the registration would not be right on the finished piece of art. If the overlay shrank, you would also have trouble. . . . So it was a very different age— almost a manual kind of reproduction of the art. Again, this is why the four-color process was not used as much because it was a more difficult thing to get the colors exactly right on the art."

When one looks at the yellow lights shining out of each window in Greenwich Village artist Antonio Frasconi's cover for Dylan Thomas' *A Child's Christmas in Wales*, one senses the manual labor that was involved in producing these album covers. Frasconi himself was arguably the most distinctive of Caedmon's album cover designers. Caedmon first offered the Uruguayan refugee the covers from its early series of Spanish language drama recordings but Frasconi refused on grounds that the *Compania Espanola de Teatro Universal* was a Franco-endorsed group. Frasconi went on to design many album covers for Caedmon, however. In addition to the second cover for *A Child's Christmas in Wales,* which was originally designed by Sonino, these included the covers *Dylan Thomas Volumes 3* and *4* and the Hopkins, Lorca and St. Millay covers among others.

Other artists who worked in the medium included Leo and Diane Dillon, a young husband and wife design team out of Cooper Union College. Holdridge recalls that it was Diane who first approached Caedmon; Holdridge liked the portfolio she was shown and quickly assigned the young artist work designing the black and dust jacket sleeves that were used in the Shakespeare Recording Society series. According to Holdridge, upon first seeing the finished work, she recalls that she commented that one of the characters looked "very Negroid." As Holdridge recalls: "She [Dillon] blushed. It was at that point she told me that Leo was black." However, Holdridge was so impressed with the Dillons that she also assigned them the task of illustrating the covers for Ezra Pound's recordings. (Indeed, it is perhaps the result of the Dillons' earlier work on the SRS series that Pound appears so "Lear-like" in the distinctive woodcut print that was used on the cover of both of his Caedmon LPs.) As such, Pound's image is rendered—if somewhat obliquely—in the visual "discourse" of the SRS series.

Fritz Eichenberg also designed many simulated woodcut album covers for Caedmon. With its use of Eichenberg, who had been an illustrator for the Modern Library in the 1930s, Caedmon strengthened its association with the Modern Library in its Random House modality. As Holdridge recalls: "Fritz had been doing many books. He illustrated most of the classics like Jane Austen, Charlotte Bronte and all of those. In fact, we'd grown up with these books." As Holdridge recalls Eichenberg's style: "He'd started in Germany and learned his art there and had a very individual style. It came out of the German expressionist style." Eichenberg designed the covers for James Mason's *Ecclesiastes* and for McKenna and Cusack's reading of Joyce's *Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* as well as Caedmon's recordings of Burns and Longfellow among other recordings. Eichbenberg also designed the covers for Caedmon's twelve-volume *Folksongs of Great Britain* series using "somewhat caricatured bodies" as Holdridge recalls. A certain postmodern parody is well in evidence in those album covers. As Holdridge acknowledges: "He brought his own identifiable sense of satire to the recordings. With the folk songs it was perfect." As she adds: "We never turned down anything that Fritz did because it came from his wealth of sensibility and experience and artistic truth."

There was no single graphic design style that unified Caedmon recordings but many of the most distinctive designs paid homage to the legacy of modernist art. This was particularly true of the Klee-like design that graced the cover of the *Caedmon Treasury of Modern Poets Reading.* On occasion, Caedmon's album cover art included expensive color reproductions of modern art, including Picasso's portrait of Gertrude Stein that graced her 1956 LP and a reproduction of a painting by Juan Miró that graced the cover the 1957 *spoken text* recording of Joyce's *Ulysses*. However, even when a reproduction of a modern artwork was used, it was often surrounded with elements of graphic design that made allusions to other modernist art; the design of the Stein recording simultaneously invoked Mondrian, for example. That the graphic design of the 1950s appropriated modernist art is broadly acknowledged; in some sense, graphic designers are at the scene of the postmodern appropriation of modernist art or the second face of modernism in its image-differentiated modality. However, the graphic designers used by Caedmon also alluded to contemporary art in ways that were separate from that historical appropriation. Some designers made allusions to particular schools of graphic design instead of fine art. The cover for *T.S. Eliot Reading Poems and Choruses*, for example, was designed by Gobin Stair and featured a highly abstract leaf design that invoked the kinetic arts movement. In contrast, the Auden cover evoked the Swiss style of industrial corporate design popularized by Paul Rand; the geometric patterns of this style were said to reflect a "universal" symbolic that signified the spirit of the new postwar internationalism.

As was appropriate for the spoken word recording as an artifact of media shift, many album covers were characterized by a radical visual intertextuality that evoked different fields of media. Through its use of drawings and designs by cartoonists Vic Voic and Bill Sokol, Caedmon signaled a type of visual intertextuality with *The New York Times* in particular. Holdridge and Mantell first saw Voic's line drawings in the *Times.* As Holdridge recalls: "So we looked up this V.V. He did our logo in a number of different postures—Caedmon with a little cat, Caedmon with the pan-pipes, and sitting and standing, and riding an elephant." (One of the earliest images produced by Voic was a monk reading scripture at the microphone.) This cartoon "Caedmon" was essential to the visual signature of the record company. *Times'* cartoonist Sokol also designed many of Caedmon's early album covers, including those for Edith Sitwell, Wallace Stevens and William Carlos Williams and often used bird motifs in his designs, perhaps reflecting the fact that the poetry often troped as birdsong. Sokol rendered the eccentric Sitwell as a peacock, for example. Holdridge suggests that this rendering is symbolic in that it evokes both Sitwell in her fancy dress and the peacock in the *Façade* sequence. While visually entertaining, the Sitwell cartoon is also clearly parodic. Indeed, in this sense it is relatively postmodern.

Caedmon also participated in the reproduction of the legacy of visual art in postmodern media of full image spectrum reproduction. To my eye, the visual signature of Caedmon's covers evokes the lush "culture as compensation" aesthetic of the periodical encyclopedia of the arts *Horizon* as the archetypal fifties' print publication. This lush visual signature was typical of the ideological cultural warfare during the 1950s, which relied heavily on photographic reproductions of the historical archive of visual and plastic fine arts as part of the ongoing scene of mass culture or the so-called "museum without walls" as a mass-mediated "compensation" for primary art culture and artisanal culture. Typically, album covers that involved reproductions of historical visual and plastic arts didn't necessarily relate to the content of any particular album. The Caedmon cover of the SRS production of *The Taming of the Shrew* featured a reproduction of eighteen-century playing card figures, for example, while the cover of *Othello* featured a reproduction of a work by the contemporary artist Pavel Tchelitchew. This collapse of aura or the historical situatedness of both fine art and popular culture images—and of therefore of historical reference—is essentially at the scene of the postmodern reproduction of art in its visual modality as a sense-differentiated analogue to the technical translation of the legacy of print into post-print full sound spectrum secondary voice media.

Another form of intertextuality was signaled with the use of Joseph Blumenthal of the Spiral Press to print Caedmon's album covers. It was Blumenthal who chose which stock to use for Caedmon covers. Almost all were made of richly textured stock, including expensive matte and pebbled finishes. Blumenthal's preference for molded and imported paper stocks evoked a kind of tactile paper fetish that was very noticeable in small press publishing as a whole in the 1950s but which was also very evocative of small press modern publishing of the 1920s. As Holdridge recalls: "Those papers were more expensive but they were evocative in a special way and so we did use them occasionally." These paper stocks added a layer of intensely pleasurable tactility to the LP as an aural object. Arguably, this hyper-tactility as a material sign unified Caedmon's otherwise visually eclectic album covers. Most of the Caedmon covers of the late 1950s in particular are so well designed that one experiences visual pleasure as a kind of visceral splash of color on the retina. This tactile element increased that pleasure, which was itself a supplement to the aural pleasure produced by Caedmon's highly warm or reverberant sound-signature. All of this attention to detail also produced a physical art-object that could be displayed in any home.[10]

These material production values were also supplemented by a verbal apparatus that mediated between each poet and his or her secondary or mass audience as part of the publisher's *peritext*. As a rule, the liner notes to Caedmon's *read text* recordings were extremely minimalist. The liner notes that framed the *Caedmon Treasury of Modern Poets Reading* economically positioned modern American poetry on LP as the supplement to the legacy of British poetry, for example, and are representative of the genre. They began by noting:

> Some of the best of the twentieth century is gathered here. Not always the most reasoned thought, perhaps, or the most momentous, but certainly some of the true and the beautiful, which after-generations may well regard as we do the words of Keats and Hopkins and Donne.

After outlining what poets' interpretations of their own work adds to "a full comprehension of the poems," the notes explicitly proceeded to position Caedmon Records and the LP as a supplement to Ezra Pound's system of micro-notation as a method for transcribing modern prosody by observing: "Decades ago, Ezra Pound strove for the same effect when he introduced a sort of musical notation system, placing phrases slightly above or below one another." Ultimately, the liner notes suggest that diacritical and typographical innovations of modern poetry arose as the result of a "struggling with this problem of perfect communication between author and reader"—or the limitations of the phonotext as inscribed in graphotext, to use Garrett Stewart's terminology. Postwar sound recording in its utopian aspect has solved these problems, however. As the liner notes observe in an off-hand promotion of the Caedmon line of spoken word records: "The true third dimension of the printed page is the recording; and thanks to the ubiquitous Caedmon recording machine, many of poets represented in this album can be heard in full-length records of their own."

The verbal notes for major modern poets were similarly minimalist and were also seemingly addressed to an audience that was more familiar with orality—including secondary orality—than print *per se*. Many of Caedmon's *read text* voice documents, such as the Edith Sitwell LP, lacked any verbal apparatus at all. The back album cover merely presented black and white photographs of Sitwell's amethyst-ringed hands and her iconic face in semi-profile. Almost as sparingly, the liner notes to *T.S. Eliot Reading Poems and Choruses* merely listed the works Eliot read on his album and reprinted three one-or-two sentence excerpts from anonymous reviews of his LP in *Harper's Magazine, The New York Times* and *High Fidelity*. The inclusion of the latter review, which concisely noted that "Eliot's listeners will certainly recognize in this record the fulfillment of the poet's own dicta on the uses of poetry," indicates that the album was clearly aimed at the postwar audiophile. Like the Sitwell record, Eliot's LP was graced with a black and white photograph of Eliot. Iconic photographs—often of the poet reading or speaking into a microphone—were a key part of the publisher's *peritext*. These were effectively indices of the postwar cult of intellectual celebrity, in which sense-differentiated images of the author as a celebrity supplemented his or her written text as visual "analogues" to his or her mass-mediated voice-image.

When a verbal *peritext* was included, typically it involved only one to three very simple and short paragraphs. These generally positioned the significance of the author within American letters. This self-effacing communication suggests a democratic hail across the classes and across castes of cultural distinction. The simple diction and the short sentences that characterized Caedmon's peritextual address as a spoken word publisher to each poet's audience also indicates an opening of the field, and a refusal of critical or interpretive mediation. This value almost certainly reflected Mantell's own personal distaste for literary criticism. This minimalism also had the effect of letting the auditor him or herself determine the significance of the poetry. Ultimately, the minimalism of this verbal frame seems to have generally enabled a certain postmodern proliferation of meaning.

The last few sentences of the single paragraph introducing Wallace Stevens, for example, economically framed that poet's contribution to American letters as follows:

> Born in Pennsylvania in 1879, Wallace Stevens never dedicated himself to the penniless pursuit of poetry. Rather, he proclaimed that poetry was the aura of his or anyone's life, by choosing a career as an insurance executive. In the great bulk of his poems this adjustment to reality is reflected; yet he never exploited one aspect of his life for the benefit of the other, and his poetry has become necessary to us for its own sake, because it is unique, and sincere, and a constant invocation of beauty.

William Carlos Williams was also introduced in one short paragraph that sketched out the biographical details of his life, and outlined his place in American letters with similar simplicity. "Poet and medical practitioner, William Carlos Williams began a way of life which was never, essentially to change," they observed. "For in that year Dr. Williams settled down to practice in Rutherford, New Jersey and in that year also, he published his first book of poetry."

However, in the case of Williams the liner notes are also interesting for the way that they condense and reduce a broader body of criticism that has been written about the poet. As they noted:

> There is a grass-roots vitality in the poems which is distinctly American-town-sprung. The ordinary, the commonplace and matter-of-fact, are for Dr. Williams matter of poetry. Yet he never idealizes or romanticizes . . . . Williams offers his images as he sees them in their everyday commonplaceness, and asks us to know them for their poetry. "To each thing," he has said, "its special quality, its special value that will enable it to stand alone. When each poem has achieved its particular form unlike any other, when it shall stand alone – then we have achieved our language."

The diction of these notes indicates that they were addressed to an audience that presumably was not familiar with Williams' poetry or literary criticism. Indeed, they seem to be written in the characteristic simple or reduced English that is so characteristic of postwar publishing as directed to both international audiences and the "common man."

For the most part, Caedmon's liner notes did not intervene in questions of a writer's literary reputation. However, it did so in the case of Gertrude Stein, perhaps because of the negative connotations of Gertrude Stein's name in contemporary American popular culture. In their entirety, those notes read:

> The place of Gertrude Stein in American letters rests upon her brilliant re-examination of the English language. Using words as the cubists used line and color, she found new ways of expressing reality; built up arrangements of grammar and thought which seemed at times senseless, yet brought into being such a stimulating concept of immediacy – a concept peculiar to the needs of the twentieth century – that the best of her generations' writers and artists came to learn from her. Around her in Paris the came and went: Hemingway, young Scott Fitzgerald, Picasso, Pound.
>
> Dogmatic, strong-minded, impervious to ridicule, she reminded Pound of an inverted pyramid, and was the butt of innumerable witticisms. That she weathered them was not remarkable, in view of her basic integrity and devotion to her work. "Eventually," as she once remarked, " it comes out all right, and you have this very queer situation which always happens with the followers: the original person has to have in him a certain element of ugliness. You know that is what happens over and over again: the statement made that it is ugly – the statement made against me for the last twenty years. And they are quite right, because it is ugly. But the essence of that ugliness is the thing which will always make it beautiful. I myself think it much more interesting when it seems ugly, because in it you see the element of the fight."

In the case of Stein, some of the writer's own criticism was uncharacteristically incorporated in the publisher's *peritext* in that this quotation was drawn from the

1926 lecture that she had given at Oxford entitled "Composition as Explanation," which had been arranged by Edith Sitwell.

Of all the poets that Caedmon recorded, only Auden chose to write his own liner notes. Auden's ambivalence about the recording session was seemingly reflected in their tone. He began by noting:

> In trying to think about what I could say about these poems, which would have any point or value, I have let myself be guided by my own experience in listening to other poets reciting their work. The formal structure of a poem is not something distinct from its meaning but as intimately bound up with the latter as the body is with the soul. When one reads a poem in a book one grasps the form immediately, but when one listens to a recitation, it is sometimes very difficult to "hear" the structure. If these notes sound a bit schoolmasterly, I am sorry, but it is very easy to ignore them.

Auden's notes were so excessively formalist to be almost belligerently so. One entry that was drawn from the *Buccolics* series, for example, read:

> *Streams.* In each quatrain, lines 1 and 2 have twelve syllables each and masculine endings, line 3 has nine syllables and a feminine ending. A syllable within line 1 rhymes with a syllable within line 3, the final syllable of line 2 rhymes with the penultimate syllable of line 4, and the penultimate syllable of line 3 rhymes with a syllable within 4.

The only moments when Auden departed from this austere formalism in order to address the thematic content of his poems occurred on several occasions when he cited the discourse of man, or the discourse of the humanities. Auden described *Precious Five*, for example, as "an address to the five organs, the nose, the ears, the hands, the eyes, the tongue, through which a man establishes relationships with the outside world." He also introduced *Buccolics* as "seven poems . . . which have in common the theme of man, as a historical or history-making person, to nature." These record jacket notes offer a record of the poet clinically performing two interpretive regimes: the formalist concerns of the New Criticism and the discourse of postwar humanism.

In general, the *peritexts* that were used to frame Caedmon's *spoken text* and dramatic recordings differed significantly from those used frame *read text* records. *Spoken text* recordings were the most discursive of all of Caedmon's records. Perhaps expectedly, the discourse of the postwar humanities was most evidence in the liner notes for these, including the very early recordings that were made of the works of Wordsworth, Shelley and Browning. The first line of the notes that framed the Sir Cecil Hardwicke's performance of the works of *The Poetry of Wordsworth*, for example, noted: "Wordsworth sang the poetry of humanity and made his name immortal." This humanistic theme is consistent in the liner notes to spoken word records although it is always applied with a light touch. For example, *The Poetry of Alexander Pope* is recuperated by this humanistic peritextual apparatus because of the poet's ability "to reason philosophically on the nature of Man."

The liner notes to relatively late *spoken text* records completely codified this discourse, however. The liner notes to *Walt Whitman: Crossing Brooklyn Ferry and Other Poems* as read by Ed Begley, for example, noted that while Whitman "wrote of the common man in the New World," that "not only America and the West, but all of humanity is being celebrated." At the same time, these notes situated Whitman as an "American bard" whose *Leaves of Grass* made "a unique American statement in a unique form." The liner notes effectively conflated the postwar discourse of the postmodern humanities with the postwar discourse on American letters. However, ultimately the differences between the liner notes Caedmon's *read text*, *spoken text* and dramatic text recordings suggest that they are of different genres, which in turn suggests that they arose from different communicative situations. Educators, in particular, as the primary consumers of *spoken text* records, seem to have required some discursive contingency of value.

The discourse of postwar humanism was the most common discursive frame for Caedmon *spoken text* recordings but it was not typically used for *read text* recordings. The extended notes that framed *Archibald MacLeish Reads His Poetry* proved to be an exception to this rule, however. If these liner notes do not frame MacLeish's poetry very effectively, they outline the larger rhetorical engagements of the postmodern humanities in a postmodern world as a discursive contingency of value, which underwrote the material production of poetry in the postwar era. Those notes began by observing:

> To call Archibald MacLeish a major poet is to indicate much about his contribution to letters, and too little about his present-day significance. Statesman, soldier, journalist, Librarian of Congress, teacher and radio playwright as well, he has managed, in a schizophrenic age, to act as a whole man; to be neither Actor, dominant, nor Thinker, in full retreat, but a responsible humanist whose participation follows from his profound awareness of realities.

References to humanistic thought abound throughout the notes, including a passage that emphasizes the "the fundamental relationship between man and the earth which bears him," and another that remarks: "The note of anguish ringing through all of these poems is a cry less of the individual than of mankind as a whole." Observing MacLeish's critique of modern science and the need to return to affect or feeling—in what is implicitly a postmodern era—the notes quote MacLeish's own statement: "Unless we can not only perceive, but also feel, the race of men to be more important than one man, we are merely fighting back against the water."

However, undoubtedly the most important of these liner notes were those in which Holdridge and Mantell referred to themselves collectively as "Caedmon." It is here in this peritextual apparatus that the record company can essentially be located at the scene of the postmodern—both in the sense of discursively mediating modern poetry for secondary audiences in post print mass media and in terms of discursively re-writing the toxic tropes surrounding the over-determined figure of Caedmon/Cadmus in both modern (or humanist) and modernist (or anti-humanist) discourse. Arguably, the notes that frame and contain the voice of Pound on *Ezra Pound, Volume I* are the quintessential scene of the postmodern in this sense.

The notes on the first Pound LP were almost certainly written by Holdridge because they correspond so closely to her account of meeting Pound and the outcome of their visits to the poet. Fittingly, in framing and justifying the validity of recordings of a treasonous poet that many Americans were firmly convinced should have been put to death—including Holdridge herself—those notes began by justifying Pound's inclusion in the Caedmon catalogue on purely literary grounds:

> The importance of a major poet's voice, as a guide to passers-by and a prime source for students, has never been better illustrated than by this recording of Ezra Pound. Where the music of Dylan Thomas flows over his meanings, or the oracular tone of T.S. Eliot pronounces without interpreting, we have in the reading of Pound that combination of scholarly ease, prosodic mastery and rapscalleous personality that is the essence of his verse.

Essentially, these notes contained Pound's his voice within a postmodern "poetry system" that also included the voices of T.S. Eliot and Dylan Thomas.

The liner notes then switched from critical framework into a narrative account of how Caedmon's founders—who are initially identified only as "we"—met Pound. Many of Caedmon's liner notes provided a kind of narrative account of the recording session as a primary performance context for Caedmon's secondary audiences. To some degree, the narrative of the Pound recording followed this genre, observing:

> We first met Ezra Pound at St. Elizabeth's Hospital, whence we had gone uninvited, after our letters remained unanswered, in the hope of persuading him to record. It was a faint hope, and it we staked close to our last $20 to take the midnight bus to Washington.

The liner notes reconstructed the journey of an unidentified "we" in order to confront the confined poet effectively standing in as surrogates for a wider American public. They flatly admitted: "We came to Pound, as most people do to Pound's poetry, with less than total sympathy." The narrative, which is ostensibly a tale of "Caedmon's" first encounter with Pound, then repeats a scaled back version of the slabs of bread and mayonnaise incident outlined by Mantell. In the series of events that are recounted a few paragraphs later, "Caedmon" is subsequently attacked by a series of phallic foodstuffs—including a loaf of French bread, a salami, and a circular slab of provolone—in effect reflecting a psychological truth about the poet's use of language, if not a clearly identifiable series of events upon which both of Caedmon's founders have agreed.[11]

The account is then interrupted at this juncture by a verbal portrait of Pound himself. The liner notes in this section conflate psychological, political and literary discourse—in effect reflecting unresolved views of Americans themselves about the poet. As they observed: "Meanwhile Pound talked, of Confucius, Mussolini, the habits of squirrels, the end of his friendship with Cummings over an argument involving the language of blue jays." Here, Holdridge and Mantell—but almost certainly primarily Holdridge—re-inscribed the official position that Pound was mad. In the next sentence, the liner notes immediately re-inscribed the poet's position in cultural and literary history, noting: "If he often sounded outrageous we imagined the outrage of others when Pound first championed Frost, Joyce, and Eliot." The narrative switched from psychological and literary discourse to political discourse in the following line—effectively re-inscribing the confusion in the popular imagination as to Pound's exact political views—by disjunctively observing: "A man may be so far left he seems right, and so far right he seems wrong." From this discursively schizophrenic portrait emerges an account of Caedmon's first recording session. Echoing the semiotics of lunacy, the notes framed that session as follows:

> By afternoon, he was ready to record—in Provençale, and on our promise not to release the recording while he was confined. 'Bird in cage does not sing,' he said, many times. The machine was set up on the lawn, and Pound began to recite. These lyrics of onomatopoetic, and as he sang of birds, the birds perched overhead sang too. In the background, inmates hooted.

A footnote informs Caedmon's audiences that this reading will be included on a subsequent volume of Pound recordings. The liner notes ultimately do not conform to the accounts of the recording session genre because in fact this recording has never been released.

In this case, then, the liner notes were notable for the way that they elided a description of the primary performance context. Indeed, they conclude by noting: "Upon his release from St. Elizabeth's, his friend and publisher, James Laughlin, finally persuaded him to make this definitive recording of his poetry, before sailing from these shores for his beloved Rapallo." In effect, the notes offer this account as a substitute for the session with Laughlin, which was undertaken at the nearby U.S. Recording Laboratory shortly after Pound's release from St. Elizabeth's. In their totality, the liner notes ultimately recuperate Pound as "rapscalleous" personality and a lunatic—in effect discursively neutralizing the political content of the works that the poet had chosen to record for the label and the real circumstances by which he agreed not for Caedmon but rather for his print publisher James Laughlin.

However, perhaps most essentially the liner notes are interesting for the way that Holdridge and Mantell were collectively identified—and in relation to a poet of Pound's stature—only as "Caedmon." The reference occurs in the context of a reference to personal communication between Pound and Mantell and/or Holdridge that arose after their recording session with the poet. As a result of the visit to St. Elizabeth's, the liner notes reveal that:

> There ensued a warm correspondence between Pound and Caedmon and during this time we spent hours decoding his letters, and days tracking his friends. These included a Fullerbrushman, a would-be poet whose aunt grew figs while he walked to Mexico, and a chap who has since been jailed for attempting to interfere with the passage of time in a Clinton, Tennessee school.

The light tone here is typical of the kitschy discourse that prevailed in publicity about the company and on some of its liner notes. The liner notes seem to be indirectly alluding to the anthology that Pound hoped to persuade Caedmon to undertake. In this case, an unidentified Fullerbrushman is representative of the quality of Pound's literary acquaintances while in St. Elizabeth's; "the would-be poet whose aunts grew figs while he walked to Mexico" may be reference to Armand Petracca, the young poet from Hoboken who drove Holdridge and Mantell to Conway to record MacLeish, who was also a friend of Pound.[12] However, the latter allusion is particularly important in that it referred to the September 1956 riot in Clinton, Tennessee against the integration of the Tennessee school system, which had been organized by John Kasper, a frequent visitor of Pound's (Torrey 225-231). Kasper not only opposed integration of the school system, he was subsequently indicted for the bombing of a Nashville elementary school that was in the process of being integrated a year later. The anti-Semitic Kasper also advocated denying Jews the right to vote. Pound's association with Kasper had the effect of delaying his release from St. Elizabeth's. Despite mounting international pressure, American public opinion remained firmly against him.

The "warm correspondence between the poet and Caedmon" is particularly ironic given Pound's extended critique of "origins" of Western civilization and the scene of writing itself in the *Cantos* and the nature of his relations with Holdridge and Mantell as revealed in both published and unpublished correspondence. However, it has a much broader rhetorical function. These liner notes involve not only a postmodern re-writing of the toxic legacy of the fascist discourse on the so-called "origins" of writing but also even more essentially the containment of the very real and ongoing threat of fascism *within* America during the postwar period. Just as the "massage" of the LP contained his message not through censorship but through mediation, the liner notes are at the scene of the postmodern in that the involve the rhetorical framing of Pound's "message" and the discursive containment of the ongoing threat of fascism within America, significantly in the register of kitsch. Essentially, the liner notes rehabilitate Pound's reputation before an audience more familiar with media of secondary orality than with print. (As is well known, Pound's actual rehabilitation was not achieved; indeed, upon landing in Italy he is widely reputed to have given the fascist salute.) This containment works only to the extent that Pound's mass audience doesn't actually *read* his literary works and the *Cantos* in particular. In this sense, then, the LP is a true supplement to his literary works—as well as to his wartime broadcasts.

If Pound can be seen as a modernist anti-Cadmus, Dylan Thomas as the bardic poet of secondary orality was effectively a postmodern "Caedmon." Significantly, Holdridge and Mantell also identify themselves as "Caedmon" in the peritextual verbal apparatus that was part of several of the Thomas records. The liner notes that were included on the album cover of a 1957 pressing of *Dylan Thomas Volume 2* followed the typical pattern of outlining the circumstances of the recording session as a primary performance context, noting: "We began to record at midnight, with rented equipment, in a borrowed unswept hall." They proceeded to outline the difficulty of this session by observing: "This was no easy glide-through like last time." In their aggregate, these brief three paragraphs inscribe the bohemian atmosphere in which the final session was undertaken while also offering a final portrait of the poet himself as he "sail[s] out to die." The second paragraph in particular inscribes the aura of immortality that was part of all of the Thomas notes by observing: "Somehow this time it was for keeps, or he seemed to feel it was: he kept trundling back to the two Caedmons at the controls, asking what we thought the lines meant, and what his reading meant, whether we thought the poem any good at all." The "two Caedmons at the controls" seems to refer to the supplemental engineering that was involved in producing this recording given the difficulty that the poet had performing on that occasion. However, the reference to the "trundling" Thomas seems particularly discordant and even violent. As noted by Marx, kitsch characteristically contains power relations that are embedded in the commodity-fetish. This is true of the final finished recording. However, in this case these power relations are also revealed paratextually. Something is being verbally contained here.

Holdridge and Mantell also retrospectively identified themselves as "Caedmon" on the liner notes on the seventh pressing of the first Dylan Thomas record, which was published in May 1958.[13] In addition to reconstructing that carefree and first recording session, the liner notes inscribe the idea that: "No-one, and Dylan probably least of all, realized that in one afternoon he had given to the world the best of himself, for all time." They also frame Thomas' performance as a kind of "life-cry flung at death." For the first time, the liner notes approach the spiritual semiotics of sacrifice and crucifixion that are so much a part of the legend of Dylan Thomas as the first poet of secondary orality. Holdridge and Mantell inscribed themselves as "Caedmon" on these notes in the context of noting, somewhat disjunctively: "While part of Caedmon kept Dylan from fidgeting, the other part raced to Gotham and back again" (in order to retrieve books from Frances Steloff's Gotham Book Mart in order that the recording session might proceed). Once again, like Pound the poet is identified in relation to voice recording technology—microphones and playback machines—even as he is tied to different media systems (*Harper's Bazaar* and the Gotham Book Mart). However seemingly innocent, these liner notes are also written in the discourse of kitsch in ways that are as violent as that which contains Pound. Something happens to Thomas as he approaches the microphone. He is reduced to a childlike figure who fidgets and who must be entertained. What is being contained here is not the fascism within but something perhaps not unlike it, if perhaps on the other end of the political spectrum. This symbolic violence is in fact characteristic of midcult as an ideological apparatus that mediates between two political extremes. This violence is reinforced on the liner notes as a postmodern paratextual apparatus that in the act of describing or mediating its object fundamentally transforms it.

While Holdridge and Mantell inscribed themselves as "Caedmon" on the PR they wrote for their company, it is only in the liner notes to the first Pound LP, and to the first and second Thomas LPs, and the later *Dylan Thomas Reading His Complete Recorded Poetry* that they refer to themselves prominently and collectively as "Caedmon." However, Holdridge and Mantell continually returned to those first two recording sessions with Thomas on the liner notes that were scripted for subsequent Thomas albums. *Dylan Thomas Reading* and *Dylan Thomas Reading a Visit to America and Other Poems* as *Volumes 3* and *4* in the series include descriptive accounts of the contexts in which the recordings included on each of the albums were made; perhaps unsurprisingly, the notes that describe the private recording on the second side of *Volume 3* are extremely vague and give no details about when Thomas was recorded and by whom.

The notes on *Volume 4* are considerably more expansive and reflective. However, they are also relatively discursively heterogeneous in ways that speak to discursive containment. They try somewhat unsuccessfully to incorporate Thomas into the discourse of humanism, for example, with a verbal apparatus that is a form of classicist kitsch, describing the crowds in front of whom he performed as a menacing "Cerberus" to which Thomas threw his "meat" in the form of one of his comedic icebreakers. Simultaneously, they castigate those who would describe Thomas as an inferior imitator of Gerard Manley Hopkins by reminding them that his form of poetic art instead went back to Homer. The notes are also interesting because of the way that they situate Thomas in relation to the historical phenomenon of the poetry and lecture circuit and because of the way they once again invoke the rhetoric of crucifixion, noting:

> "A Visit to America" is one of the funniest pieces ever written on the lecturing clan, and we are lucky to have it in the richly humorous Thomas delivery. But it is also, in retrospect, a kind of self-crucifixion before the

> multitudes, and we hear now what the audience failed to perceive then, the bitterness of a man bewildered and alone among throngs of his admirers.

The theme of bewildered and naïve American audiences unwittingly observing Thomas' self-destruction repeats on several of the liner notes for Thomas recordings including the Poetry Center's production of *Under Milk Wood,* which was released around the same time and which also emphasized the fact that that Thomas was recorded shortly before his death. Pathos clearly sells.

The notes that frame the latter LP also fetishize Thomas to some extent as a "matchless speaking instrument." The comments of reviewers of Thomas' earlier recordings, which are repeated on that album and subsequent LPs, amplified this fetishizing discourse to some extent. These kind of *epitexts,* as incorporated into the *peritext,* were key in the notes in the seventh volume of the series of Thomas recordings, *An Evening With Dylan Thomas Reading His Own and Other Poems.* On that album, Irwin Edman of *The Saturday Review* noted: "He [Thomas] reads his verse and his prose with such melodious power and such subtly and ardently projected rhythms, that one feels that goods as it is, his poetry on the printed page is dull in comparison." In contrast, Harvey Breit of *The New York Times* noted: "'Under Milk Wood' is a cello concerto—if you substitute Dylan's voice for Casals' cello. The solo passages are lovingly modulated, ranging from glissando to bawdy fortissimo." The liner notes on one of the last Dylan Thomas recordings published in the post-acquisition period subsequently condensed the comments of these earlier reviewers by framing Thomas's contribution to the vinyl archive as a "Caruso of the spoken word." With the use of this fetishizing rhetoric, Thomas was reduced to a voice that emanated from a machine and a kind of reified relic of the sound recording archive.

Arguably, it is only on *An Evening With Dylan Thomas* where the liner notes find the tone in which to frame the Thomas phenomenon. They begin by noting how much Thomas' performance style varied in America compared to the style he used on the BBC and suggest that America provided a "liberating influence" that allowed Thomas to fully develop his reading style. They also re-formulate the introductory icebreaker and a spoken word genre—this time as a kind of "red cape" which the poet as a "small bull" waved in front of the audience who "might be about to hurl barbs into his tender sides."

(However indirectly and comically, this invocation of the bullfight also invokes the rhetoric of sacrifice if not outright crucifixion.) The notes proceeded to outline Thomas' performance style, the kinds of works he typically read, the demographics of his live audiences, and his own ambivalence about performing his works in front of American audiences. In effect, they describe Thomas' performances as a historical phenomenon and suggest that it is as "a historical document of a particularly intimate kind" that the recording should be listened to by secondary audiences.

The next album to be published, *Dylan Thomas Reading His Complete Recorded Poetry*, was almost entirely devoid of a *peritextual* verbal apparatus. Only four short paragraphs framed the audio collection. Because this was a definitive collection of all the poetry that Thomas ever recorded, the focus in the liner notes was on the origins of the voice documents that are reproduced in the album. As already noted, this collection of Thomas' spoken word performances of his works lacked the unity of a printed collection. Arguably, it is only photographs of Thomas at his home in Laugharne, Wales—which were taken by Rollie McKenna—that provide the album with any semiotic coherence. As visual paratexts, those photographs are perhaps a necessary "compensation" for the archival heterogeneity of Thomas' voice image. However, significantly they are also a visual technology that romanticized Thomas.

Liner notes for Thomas albums in the post-acquisition period often echoed the discourse that had first cohered around Thomas during "the LP moment." While Caedmon employee Paul Kresh framed the Thomas legacy the most concisely by describing Thomas as "a Caruso of the spoken word," that formulation omitted the often comic and yet insistently Christ-like rhetoric of sacrifice and crucifixion that cohered—seemingly incongruously—around the drunken and pansexual Thomas after his death. Those semiotics were driven by historical forces that exceeded Thomas' historical person and most notably by the shift in media systems from the Gutenberg to the post-Gutenberg Galaxy or mediasphere. Those semiotics also reflected America's mass-mediated Cold War reading and cultural crusade and rhetoric of "mission" that surrounded that crusade, as a first supplement to the missionary network of the European era. In this way, Thomas as the first poet of secondary orality was discursively framed, often on the semiotic level, however incongruously and indeed often ironically as a kind of postmodern "Christ."[14]

As an instrument of secondary orality within a larger media machine, Thomas was at the scene of postmodern parody that satirized the morality of public reading. However, at the same time his vocal instrument also produced the affect that MacLeish had suggested was needed in the postmodern age. As a vocal surrogate, Thomas performed for his audience "precisely what the speaking subject does not say: the unconscious texture which associates his body-as-site with his discourse: an active texuality which reactualizes in his speech, the totality of his history" (Vasse as cited in Barthes 255). Thomas performed not only the literary word but also the existential pain of his existence as a surrogate for those who could not yet speak. This was the "sacrifice" that exceeded Thomas' historical person. Ultimately, that surrogacy enabled the emergence of a postmodern spoken poetry of affect, as a supplement to poetry of the printed page, and to the broader history of the modern or modernism and modernity.

NOTES

[1] The postwar return to realism as an aesthetic value and mode of representation clearly exceeds the recording aesthetic of postwar sound recording. It is part of the postwar rehabilitation of sense-differentiated media of reproduction—film and sound recording—in particular.

[2] At the same time, any raw voice document can be acoustically engineered to some extent. The poems that were privately recorded and included on *Side Two* appear to have been subsequently technically manipulated on *Dylan Thomas Reading His Complete Recorded Poetry*, for example, primarily through the addition of reverb in order to simulate a public acoustic context.

[3] Record production from an edited master tape involves five steps. In the first of these steps, a record master is inscribed directly from the edited master tape. A negative, sometimes called a father, is produced from the process of electroplating this master record. This negative is used to make mothers (positives), which are then in turn used to make the stampers or sons. In turn, these negatives are used to press the final LP.

[4] By the mid 1960s, this process was automated when injection-molded records were introduced. This resulted in popular records being pressed about 100,000 at a time. Ultimately, this change to industrial scale reproduction was one of the fundamental differences in sound recording in the monaural and the stereo moments. However, in the monaural era, records were still pressed by hand.

[5] This technical deficiency was characteristic of early monaural era records. It can be heard on T.S. Eliot's reading of *The Waste Land* on *The Caedmon Treasury of Modern Poets Reading.* That recording, which was not mastered by Caedmon but retrieved from the Library of Congress, was characterized by considerable bleeding between grooves which resulted in a ghostly series of echoes and pre-echoes around certain lines as when Eliot's voice is heard intoning, "Hurry up, gentlemen, it's time" throughout "A Game of Chess," before and after he is heard actually reading that repeating line. This bleeding between excerpts of Eliot's performance of the same poem is also heard on Columbia's *Pleasure Dome* recording of Eliot, which may be derived from the same source.

[6] This postmodern reverberant sound began to be incorporated into postmodern architecture beginning in the late 1950s. As Thompson notes, among other examples the return to naturally reverberant sound was

---

signaled by construction of the hall for New York Philharmonic in 1959, which explicitly rejected dead "modern" sound as a live performance aesthetic (319).

[7] Recordings of Moore's voice prove to be an exception to this general rule. She reads considerably faster on her Caedmon recording than on her Columbia recording. This effect is heightened to some extent by Caedmon's relatively disembodied sound signature, which removes all signs of breath. T.S. Eliot also reads faster on his Caedmon *Waste Land* recording than on the excerpts from that poem that are reproduced on the *Pleasure Dome* recording. This difference cannot be read essentially given that neither the Columbia nor the Caedmon record is a "first edition" recording but rather an acoustically engineered transcription of what appears to be the same Library of Congress recording.

[8] It is important to note also that Caedmon's sound recording aesthetic or sound signature changed over time. The sound aesthetic of *read text* poetry recordings as performed by poets themselves was part of the LP moment. In contrast, Caedmon's *spoken text* recordings as read by actors did not simulate live performance but rather the intimate and context-free recordings of the mass culture industry and the radio industry in particular as voiced by iconic film actors. As such, Caedmon's *spoken text* sound also involved a synthesis of different media cultures.

[9] Interestingly, Génette positioned sound recordings outside the realm of the paratextual. As he noted: "A whole separate study . . . would perhaps be necessary to deal with another form – at least, an indirect one – of the public epitext: that consisting, in all periods, of author's public readings of their works . . . . Throughout the twentieth century readings have been widely recorded, live or in a studio. These recordings, like the notes that accompany musical recordings or even simply the information provided on record jackets or CD cases, are a mine of paratextual information. Other researchers, I hope, will work in that vein" (370). The gap identified by Genette is in some sense the object of this dissertation.

[10] Recordings produced by Caedmon and other record companies such as Angel sometimes assumed a decorative dimension of such an order that were often "reviewed" in magazines such as *House Beautiful.*

[11] Images of hunger pervade the narrative account, reflecting Holdridge and Mantell's material circumstances in the early fifties but also the semiotics of the troped discourse on food that had been so much a part of anti-fascist writing during the war. Fussell critically develops this symbolic relationship between food and wartime writing as a "compensation" for the material deprivations of life in wartime in his chapters entitled "Deprivation" and "Compensation" in *Wartime: Understanding and Behavior in the Second World War,* in particular. For an example of this trope, see also Orson Welles' radio play "His Honor, the Mayor" in *The Free Company Presents.*

[12] MacLeish himself had famously made a trip through Mexico on foot and on muleback in order to retrace the route taken by Cortéz (Ellis and Drabeck xxii.)

[13] It is uncertain when Holdridge and Mantell began referring to themselves as Caedmon in relation to Thomas since liner notes are an ephemeral genre that are typically remade from pressing to pressing.

[14] For the clearest expression of this discourse, see Edith Sitwell's review of *The Collected Poems of Dylan Thomas 1934-1953*, which explicitly compares Thomas the historical British Caedmon, "The Love of Man, the Praise of God."

Conclusion
The Voice of the Poet: Discourse Networks 1900/1950

Even as Caedmon represented a paraliterary phenomenon, spoken word recordings were produced, consumed, and disseminated within a postmodern mediasphere of acoustically technologized discourse that emerged during the postwar period. Within the context of this broader shift in the technical and sensory modalities of mass media, the LP became the software for postwar voice and sound reproduction systems and secondarily for postwar broadcasting systems. Literary spoken word recordings were only one of many genres of secondary or technologized orality within this larger mediasphere. However, the voice of the poet as a postmodern form of paraliterary discourse and a supplement to the written text was also central in this shift in media systems. On the on hand, the voice of the technologically mediated author displaced the sound of the reader's own voice, sub-vocalizing as he or she read in Garrett Stewart's terms (3). However, that mass-mediated voice also introduced new audiences to literature that were unlikely to have read otherwise, extending the performative power of the literary word by speaking to a mass audience that was more familiar with primary and secondary orality than with literature *per se*—as part of the broader scene of postwar mass culture.

While secondary orality reflected the social aging of poetry in wartime as an anti-fascist technology, it also reflected the exigencies of an attempt to create an ideologically centered and aesthetically pleasing national voice culture that supplemented RP English and the disposition of American mass-media voice. The "content" of postwar spoken word LPs was not only poetry itself but also acoustically technologized speech, as a supplement to print and to primary or non-technologized o/aurality but also to theatrical speech (and Shakespearean dramatic speech in particular) and to RP BBC English as different forms of British public speech. The postwar spoken word LP was also a supplement to the commercial disposition of America's mass culture industries and its mass-mediated voice cultures including film, radio and television voice. In sum, not only text but also aesthetic public speech was the symbolic content of the postwar spoken word LP.

The epitextual commentary that framed the production, consumption, and exchange of spoken word recordings as symbolic commodities within the United States, as continuously generated by American periodicals that ranged from *Harper's* and *The Atlantic* to *Time* and *Life* to *High Fidelity* and *House Beautiful*, indicates that they were imagined not only as a supplement to literature and literacy but also as a supplement to the disposition of modern secondary or technologized orality, including the commercial disposition of America's mass culture industry and the fascist use of radio as a mass medium, and furthermore that they were intended to supplement the American spoken word vernacular in the service of producing an ideologically centred from of public speech that could rival the symbolic power of RP British English. In this sense, *read* and *spoken text* recordings were not only a phenomenon of intermedia in which the legacy of modern literature was translated into secondary voice media. They were also overtly "supplemental" in the sense of "a thing or part [that is] added to remedy deficiencies" (*OED*). This was part of the political unconscious of the LP, and its broader utopian aspect as a symbolic commodity, in the postwar era.

In general, the discourse of "high fidelity" and the discourse of "presence" underwrote the deployment of technologies of full sound spectrum recording and reproduction as it related to classical music as a genre of secondary musical performance. As it related to orchestral music and the musical content of the LP, the discourse of "presence" in the market for LPs as symbolic commodity-objects involved a simulation of primary performance in a secondary performance context. In contrast, the discourses of "vocal projection" and vocal "essence" underwrote the consumption of spoken word recordings as a genre of secondary verbal performance. The semiotics of these discourses revealed the origins of many of the innovations of full sound spectrum recording and reproduction during the war. They also testified to the larger transfer of communicative and cultural capital from Old World to New in the postwar period as symbolic and material analogues to the transfer of raw military power.

The clearest expression of the foundational myths that underwrote the deployment of the full sound spectrum voice media for the purposes of disseminating poetry as it related to the first of these discourses, or the discourse of vocal projection, was articulated by Edward Tatnell Canby in the October 1954 edition of *Harper's Magazine*. In that article, Canby scripted a kind of a foundational narrative about the role that voice transmission technologies had played during the war. Canby began by noting:

> During the last war, as I understand it, the English language ran into an odd difficulty in transmission when the throat contact microphone used by American pilots, to free their hands and arms while flying, was tried out on British pilots. The throaty Americanese had been easily picked up by contact near the Adam's apple; but the clipped and articulated British language, even in pilot's lingo, was literally above the mike's susceptibilities and come through as unintelligible gurgling. (110)

As Canby described it, the British suffered from a vocal inadequacy in the context of military communication that paralleled their lack of military potency. In contrast, the Americans enjoyed a throaty vocal puissance that paralleled their military power.[1]

Canby was not particularly concerned whether or not this narrative of vocal transmission in wartime was true or not; indeed, he explicitly suggested that it might not be. The rhetorical point Canby was making was that situation appeared to be reversed when it came to the ability of British to project their culture through technologies of secondary orality during the postwar period. The British retained symbolic power as it related to the aesthetic dimension of technologized speech. In contrast, the Americans suffered from vocal "inadequacy" and a failure to "project." As Canby noted in the very next line: "The story is confirmed in reverse by the great new output of speech recordings on LP records—with the mike normally placed out in front of the face the English voice projects superbly, whereas the American mutter, deep down, is at a dreadful loss for intelligibility" (110).

As Canby elaborated this dilemma in relation to America's own secondary or mediated voice cultures:

> Paradoxically, we in America know more than anyone else about the physical technique of vocal projection through the loudspeaker. We have a thousand schools and departments and classes for Speech Training which, whatever the outward intent, largely produce that "voice with a

> smile" which goes straight into radio and TV for the propagation of Messages. The American Radio Voice embodies the ultimate in efficient speech transmission via the microphone, but is mostly without soul. (110)

Canby was essentially criticizing the commercial disposition of American secondary or mass-mediated public speech. Canby's anxieties about vocal projection were framed in terms of vocal soul and were clearly haunted the legacy of British theatrical projection as a form of aesthetic public speech. Simultaneously, Canby's commentary was subtly shaded by the larger electronic imperative to project American presence abroad during the postwar period. These imperatives shaped the production of a secondary or technologized voice culture that supplemented literature and drama as historical forms of public speech. Paradoxically, America's writers and not its actors would be charged with the task of generating America's vocal "soul" and projecting that soul abroad.

The discourse on vocal "essence" was an equally if not more prominent in reviews of spoken word recordings. Harry T. Moore set the stage for this discourse in an article that was published in *Poetry* in September 1949. According to Moore:

> A poet reading his own work is an important event because "the sound of a poetry is part of its meaning": by vocalizing the material, the poet can provide the listener a unique interior comment upon it. This statement is not mystic but scientific, for even if the poet can no longer remember the original impulse and intent of every phrase . . . . they are nevertheless contained in his unconscious. This is true whether the poet is an unskilled reader or a capable reciter who through repetition has stereotyped his presentation of a poem. His tempo and his crescendos, his vocal italics and his caesurae, are all important registers toward essence.[2]

The discourse of authorial essence was effectively a phenomenon of media shift in which traces of the author's body—or of an embodied linguistic subjectivity—was stored and reproduced in the LP as a medium of secondary orality. This (disembodied) authorial "essence" effectively supplemented not only an author's written text but also the disposition of the own reader's own voice subvocalizing as it read. "Essence," then, was a product of postwar media shift.

However, were spoken word records merely a reflection of bodily essence, theoretically all poets' voices would be considered equally. However, commentary in mid-century periodicals reveals that some forms of vocal "essence" had symbolic and hence exchange value while others did not. This voice-centered criticism also revealed that almost all American poets' voices were found by reviewers to be woefully inadequate in the performance or projection of their own poetry. Despite a rhetoric of authorial "essence," voice-centred commentary reveals that the disposition of the poet's voice as a socially characterized speaker was fairly important as was each poet's delivery. In sum, the market for the secondary or technologized spoken word as a symbolic commodity was shaped by extra-literacy contingencies of value, and haunted by the discourse on elocution in particular—even when voiced by critics as eminent as Moore.

In another review in *Poetry* written three years later, for example, Moore praised the "bardic" and "tongue-in-cheek" aspects of Edith Sitwell's recorded readings, the "ironic inflections" of e.e. cummings as "a skilled reader of his own verse," and Theodore Spencer's extremely precise "short-breathed measure."[3] However, in that review Moore also censored a number of American poets' *read text* recordings for a variety of shortcomings—many of which centered on their vocal identities as socially characterized speakers. Although Moore was extremely sensitive to the issue of Northeastern linguistic hegemony as this conditioned the social circulation of spoken word poetry—and praised the decision to record Robert Penn Warren in particular on the rationale that this improved the overall "health" of poetry—he ultimately criticized Warren for being "too unskilled a reader to be entirely satisfactory" (354). The issue of skill as it related to poetic delivery also entered into Moore's discussion, in effect disqualifying some poets from serious critical consideration as readers of their own verse. Robinson Jeffers received a poor review for his "meager voice that scratches its way past tightened throat muscles and gives the listener kinaesthetic [sic] agonies along his own vocal cords" (355). Moore also criticized William Carlos Williams for a recitation that has "amateurish stretches, where he lapses into monotony and slurring of syllables" (354).

The cadences of Sitwell's extremely resonant aristocratic RP intonation were often praised implicitly or explicitly for elocutionary purposes even as Moore used a very different criterion to value her spoken word performances in this particular review. "Irony" and "measure" were contingencies of value that originated largely from within institutionally situated academic contexts; in particular, Moore's comments about Spencer anticipate the fetishizing of measure that would dominate reviews of spoken word recordings in the late 1950s as an analogue to the formalist concerns of the New Criticism. However, at this juncture Spenser (who was a Harvard professor of English) and cummings' voices were effectively valued as examples of Anglo-American Northeastern Ivy League spoken word linguistic hegemony.[4] To cite these three poets' performances as ideal within the context of a voice-centered criticism is to value something else than the performance of their own works but rather their disposition of their voices as socially situated subjects. In the market for spoken word performance as a symbolic commodity, Sitwell's voice has exchange value. That of Penn Warren does not.

This type of commentary was common in all reviews of poetry recordings and typically was invoked to censor regional readers, and the voices of Southern and Western poets and authors in particular. It also conditioned most but not all reviews spoken word recordings of gay, Jewish, and working class poets—even when such poets enjoyed comparatively high reputations in print. At this juncture, women's voices were still reviewed positively although by the mid 1950s reviews of female poets' spoken word recordings would effectively disappear. Significantly, reviews of African American writers' spoken word recordings were simply not found in the mainstream periodical press during this era. This recuperatory critical apparatus—or hierarchy of distinction—shaped the contingencies of value for spoken word recordings as symbolic commodities. It was not self-identical with disposition of the actual field of cultural production. However, as it related to recorded poetry, the consolidation of a secondary or technologized voice culture on LP clearly corresponded with a certain consolidation of North Eastern linguistic hegemony. Despite Canby's foundational intervention, British voice—and particularly that of figures such as Sitwell and Auden—was clearly preferred as a symbolic commodity.

The mid-century discourse that framed the consumption of spoken word LPs as symbolic commodities—particularly as evinced in America's premier mid-cult periodical, *The Saturday Review*—indicates that the markets for spoken word recordings were largely unaffected by writers' literary or print reputations. Instead, such commentary was characterized by a hierarchy between British and American voices in which the voices of British poets and authors were invariably found to be mellifluous, eloquent and powerful, while those of America's own poets and authors were usually found to be meager, grating or inaudible. Within *The Saturday Review's* hierarchy of distinction, British voices in particular had exchange value. Much of this commentary would cohere around a phallic discourse of vocal projection. America's poets were effectively being called to produce a generative vocal discourse that was "potent" enough to found new forms of public speech that could rival the projective vocal power of that of Brits. However, *The Saturday Review's* anglophile commentary reveals that almost without exception all were found wanting. Arguably, of America's poets it was Charles Olson who fully responded to this call—albeit on the printed page rather than in the register of the spoken word. On the platform, it was Dylan Thomas alone—"booming blue thunder into the teenagers' delighted bras and briefs" in his wife's notable turn of phase—who was to embody this discourse of vocal projection the most fully as a surrogate for something that American poets could not or would not produce (Ferris 274).

Much of the commentary about poetry recordings in popular periodicals stressed the need for a secondary or technologized voice culture that could rival that of the British. That discourse was most firmly articulated within the pages of *The Saturday Review* as America's quintessential midcult institution as patterned after the older British print institution. *SR* specialized in reviews of contemporary literature. Significantly, it began reviewing two genres of sound recordings—classical recordings and spoken word recordings—in 1947 as the first year of the "audio revolution." *SR* reviewed spoken word recordings on a weekly basis; it is therefore impossible to summarize the array of epitextual commentary generated by the periodical. Nonetheless, one might begin with vocal "essence" as a kind of foundational trope that underwrote the whole spoken word industry. In the pages of *SR* as elsewhere, this trope was clearly associated with Dylan Thomas.

In a 1952 review of the emerging spoken word field, including Thomas' first Caedmon recording, *SR* critic Irwin Edman wrote:

> Voices are more intimately, even than handwritings, the expression of a whole personality. In speech, certainly the style is the man. In the bardic intoning, the rhythmic rises and falls, the Celtic half melody, half moan of Dylan Thomas one feels something of the very essence of his person.[5]

In these few short sentences, Edman was clearly repeating the discourse of vocal essence in which a poet's vocal identity essentially displaced his text-practice. This voice-centered criticism was suited to conditions of media shift and effectively served to transform writers into postwar media personalities. It is also here in this early review that Edman inscribed the discourse of vocal projection and vocal power that was so clearly associated with Thomas by noting that in reading his poetry "with such melodious power, and such subtly and ardently projected rhythms . . . one feels that, good as it is, his poetry on the printed page is dull in comparison." The phallic ability of Thomas' voice to "project" clearly displaced the impact of his work in print because of the broader mid-century discourse on vocal projection as a contingency of value.

Bardic discourse was repeated with much frequency in relation to Thomas as the first poet of secondary orality, in ways that reflected the choral nature of his voice as tinged by traces of Welsh medieval orality. Bardic "discourse" was effectively plural and choral: it was a medieval voice practice that preceded the centering of the linguistic subject during the modern bourgeois era. Edith Sitwell and Dylan Thomas were most frequently praised as "bardic." Thomas' Celtic Welsh identity, his male gender, and his aspect as the so-called "common man" effectively allowed him to "trump" Sitwell as the bard of secondary or technologized orality. In this case, the "Celtic half melody, half moan" is particularly significant in that it interrupts the hierarchical binary between British and American voices that is so often played out in reviews of this type. Celtic voices—which are the most musical of the English speaking dialects—were generally highly valued during the decade of secondary orality for their ability to perform a poetry for the "ear" rather than the "eye." To some extent, Edman's criticism reveals a certain fetishizing of Thomas' musical vocal "instrument"—significantly as this relates to the ability of his instrument to generate affect or feeling as a postmodern contingency of value.

During the decade of secondary orality, or the period between 1948 and 1957 as the larger moment of the monaural LP, the voices of Thomas and Sitwell were the most praised by *SR* critics. The celebration of these poets within the pages of the anglophile *SR* seemed to derive in part from the role that their poetry had played in wartime in the British context: both were at the scene of a sound-centered and affect-centred postmodern British poetry as a revolution in symbolic language, albeit not one explicitly recognized as such, as a supplement to modern poetry. Within the symbolic economy of a voice-centered criticism, the aristocratic disposition of Sitwell's RP English was clearly highly valued for essentially elocutionary purposes, but the case of Thomas within this symbolic economy is more complex. Thomas' performances effectively interrupted a binarized hierarchy of performance as this related to the symbolic and exchange value of British and American voices. Even as Thomas' public performances were articulated in standard BBC English, the Welsh semiotics of his voice disrupted the anglophile discourse on performance as elocution in particular. In effect, the choral multiplicity of his voice escaped the markers that conventionally define the speech of socially situated speaking subjects. In some less overt but equally fundamental way, Thomas also seems to have been a vocal surrogate for the American "common man," whose own voice was not admitted into America's emergent secondary or technologized spoken word media culture without extreme critical censure.

Astonishingly, Thomas was able to maintain his position at the center of the postwar shift from beyond the grave because of the many recordings of his performances that had been made during his lifetime which Caedmon published posthumously at approximately two-year intervals. By 1956, the public performance of the poetic word on LP was not gauged in terms of the ideologically centered tradition of RP English and traditional English declamatory or dramatic techniques that shaped primary performance but rather in terms of the model of vocal projection and vocal soul performed by Dylan

Thomas as the first poet of the LP era. Thomas' voice was frequently evoked within the pages of *SR* as an aesthetic standard by which all spoken word performance should be measured. A 1956 article by *SR* critic Harold Lawrence reviewed three Caedmon recordings of Thomas, commented on a public commemoration of Thomas' works as performed by British poets and released on the Westminster label, and effectively used Thomas' form of aural criticism as elaborated in his BBC talk "On Reading Poetry Aloud" to critique American radio and television performers performing works of literature.[6]

This kind of critical commentary indicates the search for a new kind of public speech that would articulate between heterogeneous media cultures and heterogeneous performance traditions. Essentially, Lawrence critiqued American radio and television voice as a medium for reading literature aloud as in the case of Chicago actor and TV announcer Ken Nordine who "pants, gasps, and gulps his way" through a performance of Balzac's *Passion in the Desert* or the unfortunate Dorothy Quick, whose performance of her own poetry was accompanied by music that according to Lawrence resembled "Bob and Ray's theme music for the serial, 'Mary Backstage, Noble Wife'" (60). Clearly, poetry as public speech needed to remain immune to "contagion" from American radio and television voice. At the same time, Lawrence also critiqued the use of spoken word records for elocutionary purposes and censored a recording by the British actor Cyril Ritchard for having a "second hand ring to it" (60). Lawrence also cautioned against the consumption of recordings of British actors implicitly for elocutionary purposes. Both of these voice regimes, then, were found wanting. Thomas alone effectively negotiated between these different media cultures and different performance traditions, setting a distinctive aesthetic standard for all secondary spoken word performance.

SR began to critique Thomas by the end of the monaural era, however. In a 1959 review, critic John Ciardi established some distance from the Thomas cult by observing: "I must believe that Caedmon's luck at the record-counter is due more to the drama of Thomas's voice and legend than to the very real merits of his poems."[7] Ciardi was the first to explicitly suggest that the "ability to project . . . poetic words and rhythms is the actor's craft rather than the poet's art." Ciardi also castigated Thomas' live performances for being "over-projected." While Thomas' intimate and "inward spoken" performance on *Volume I* would justly remain in Ciardi's view a spoken word monument, the critic called into question the rest of Thomas' spoken word legacy. Indeed, Ciardi went so far as to suggest that on *Volume II,* Thomas "hisses like a bad Shakespearean actor." Categorizing Thomas' performance on that album, Ciardi noted: "He rolls out the big voice and makes it boom." Summing up Thomas' contribution to the field of spoken word recording as a whole Ciardi announced: "He owned a voice like an organ and he used it with all the relish of a Welsh pub declaimer." Significantly, it is at this juncture that Thomas' ethnicity as a vocal surrogate also becomes suspect. At the time, America's own poets—and its Ivy League poets in particular—were already working towards a spoken rather than declaimed spoken word aesthetic of "reticence" and refinement. The disposition of their spoken word performances—and the value-adding or fetishized measure-centered criticism that was generated to frame those performances—does not appear to have appealed to popular audiences, however; even as those performances represented a certain broader consolidation of a national poetry archive on LP, they also seem to have represented a certain appropriation and containment of the energies of the postwar spoken word LP as a popular symbolic commodity.

In general, the voices of American poets were rarely celebrated in the pages of *SR* and always with considerable qualification. It is only in 1960 when the voices of American poets receive any due at all from Ciardi as *SR*'s preeminent spoken word critic. In a review published that year, Ciardi relegated a Spoken Arts recording of John Masefield into "the less enlightened reaches of The School System" but praised Caedmon's recording of Ezra Pound by noting that the poet "performed his own verse "in a voice that is big, banging, singsong, pretentious, arrogant and messianic all in one."[8] Astonishingly, in the same review the archly anglophile Ciardi also lauded Ginsberg's performance of "Howl," on the Fantasy label although Ciardi censored Ginsberg for stopping short of "the full Howl" by noting that Ginsberg "comes in with a helluva roar but pretty much walks away through the slush" (43).

This tone of this extraordinarily bitchy review also indicates the contingencies of voice-centered criticism that continued to cohere around spoken word recordings by many American poets, even at this relatively late date. Ciardi viciously panned Eliot's "queer" performance of *Ole Possum's Book of Practical Cats* as "dull and prissy stuff" that was "enunciated in the ponderous voice of maiden-parson," for example. Ciardi also panned the hammy "nightclub" voice of Gil Orlovitz, in effect policing and containing the disposition of unwanted spoken word sub-cultures in the national poetry archive within a withering rhetoric of vocal distinction and internalized class and ethnic violence that only the "parvenu" as social regulator can ever fully articulate. Performances that passed muster were Richard Wilbur's "fine, clean, revealing, sensitive reading." Robert Lowell's "near monotone" reading, which refused the incitement to recitation, also met with Ciardi's approval as "clean and honest," as did Stanley Kunitz' similar reticence. Significantly, Ciardi also endorsed W.S. Merwin's elaborately fetishized measure in his spoken word performance. Clearly, the era of dramatic declamation and vocal projection has come and gone; spoken word "tastes" had changed. Of all these poets, only Wilbur reads a poetry of the "inner ear" as a type of "inner audition" that signifies the ideological contingencies behind the production of a national voice culture rather than a national poetry archive *per se* at this juncture.

In general, until the end of his tenure as a *SR* critic, Ciardi's criticism indicates the vagaries of a voice-centred criticism that was fundamentally as much about the discourse of elocution, delivery, and public speech—and later of fetishized measure—as shaped by myths of secondary orality, as it was about the aesthetic value of a poet's voice-practice. In particular, Ciardi criticized the inability of certain poets to perform what they supposedly heard in their "inner ear" during the moment of poetic inspiration.[9] He frequently critiqued poets who were unable to produce this mythical phenomenon of inner audition as a contingency of value, noting: "Some very good poets (Wallace Stevens, for example) have been poor readers" (32). Under Ciardi's hierarchy of value, Frost was a much better reader than Eliot. Dylan Thomas of Volume I and the (anglophile) e.e. cummings alone were "wonderfully self-fulfilling readers" (32). Essentially, inner audition as a contingency of value appears to involve a complex scene of vocal inscription—rather than the publication of a spoken word recording as a supplement to the written text *per se*—as subject to changing market conditions for the spoken word as a symbolic commodity, or the buyer's market.

If *SR* evaluated spoken word records for popular audiences, the *Library Journal* played an equally important role in evaluating these recordings for librarians. Articles in the *Library Journal* indicate that librarians began actively archiving spoken word and musical LPs supplements to print media in 1949 and that the reasons for this archiving of LPs as supplements to the book and print media were not yet consciously codified when such archiving began. In one of the two articles about LPs that were printed in the *Library Journal*, on March 15 1949, librarian Sidney Goldstein explicitly framed this archiving as a supplement to the written historical record—particularly as this applied to a period that extended from 1933 to 1945—and to modern secondary orality. Goldstein explicitly linked literary recordings to historical recordings, noting: "If the words of La Guardia and Hitler and Wilkie and Churchill, admittedly historical, can be made to live again, why then so can the words and thoughts of Chaucer and Blake and Poe and Sandburg"(434). In rhetorical moments such as these, the project of bringing literature to life in media of secondary orality was waged. As Goldstein's remarks indicate, this supplement involved a certain collapse of history, which can also be located in the scene of postwar media shift as the scene of the postmodern.

Throughout the 1950s and the 1960s, the *Library Journal* consistently reviewed new LP recordings that might be of interest to American librarians. By May 15 1959, librarians John Hulton and Harry Weeks began framing a new phenomenon—Shakespeare on disc, or as they termed it, "The Long Playing Bard." Although Hulton and Weeks echoed the discourse of postmodern humanism in advocating the archiving of this particular recording, or the so-called universality of Shakespeare as a contingency of value, they also noted that a Shakespeare record served "another purpose which should particularly interest librarians: it reminds us of the great beauty of Shakespeare's diction" (1564). Comments such as these indicate that the discourse of elocution as it applied to Shakespearean dramatic verse as "public speech" remained primary for many American librarians as an extra-aesthetic contingency of value. In effect, American librarians were unconsciously outlining the extra-aesthetic contingencies of such recordings as a postmodern "P.A. system" and as the basis of a postmodern public sphere.[10]

American educators were also interested in the possibilities for postwar voice and sound recording. However, initially they focused not on voice software but rather on incorporating voice recording and voice playback hardware into the classroom. In a June 1949 article published in *The English Journal*, teacher Julius C. Bernstein advocated the use of such machines for this purpose even as it produced what Bernstein described as an auditor who "hears his own voice come back at him with a 'certain alienated majesty'" (330). Bernstein noted that teachers were aided in their attempts to harness potential of voice recording technologies by a certain "auditory narcissism" (330) and by the fact that "the national acclimatization to the radio . . . [is] part of our culture" (331). According to Bernstein:

> These voices coming through the loudspeaker attain dignity because the class's ears and minds are radio-conditioned. They have learned to listen to the amplified and metallic electronic voice, be it with that of a disk jockey, an announcer, an actor, a politician, or a classmate. (331)

At this stage, students used wire, disc, and tape voice recorders to record and critically reflect upon their own vocal production within the broader context of a shift from conditions of primary or non-technologized to secondary or technologized orality: the triumph of the playback machine as a means of cultural inscription had not yet occurred.

An article by another educator, Irving J. Goldberg, which was published in the same journal in March of 1952, extended Bernstein's insights. Goldberg shaped these into a formal voice-recording program that had as its explicit objective "a concrete and individual basis for speech improvement among our pupils."[11] As evidence of the program's success, Goldberg quoted "Gerry, a good student who is intensely interested in self-improvement." As this student noted of his vocal production: "Although I sound better now, I do have a drawl, a flat *a*, and a monotone" (148). These speech programs were mounted in the service of consolidating North Eastern Anglo-American linguistic hegemony. It is perhaps no wonder that with speech improvement programs such as these that so many Americans identified with Eliza Doolittle in Rogers and Hamerstein's adaptation of Shaw's *Pygmalion* in the 1956 Broadway hit musical *My Fair Lady*.[12] While the politicization of reading and writing was part of the cultural history of the postwar period, Americans were being incited to produce a linguistically standardized and technologically mediated national voice culture during this era. This was part of the political unconscious of postwar voice recording in the context of a wider shift from primary to secondary orality.

Spoken word recordings were also of interest to educators, however. Much of the discourse on the use of spoken word recordings in classroom contexts was conflated with the discourse on radio as a competing medium of cultural, educational and ideological inscription. In an edition of *School Life*, a periodical of the Office of Education, which was published in April of 1952, the "Radio-TV education specialist" Gertrude C. Broderick elaborated on how such recordings could be used as part of a program of "close listening" in conjunction with educational radio and television broadcasts. Like Bernstein, Broderick advised educators that students were "predisposed in favor of the loudspeaker even before a sound issues from it [because] a large percentage of their after-school time is devoted, as numerous studies have established, to radio listening" (104). Broderick's efforts were paralleled by the Office of Education and the Federal Security Agency, which jointly issued a Special Bulletin in 1952 that advised educators on the use of sound recordings in high school contexts. This report focused not on the competition faced from radio and sound-based mass culture but rather on the project of making literature interesting to students who would rather be reading popular print media such as *Hot Rod* magazine or *Junior Miss*. Even this bulletin, which focused on the use of such recordings to develop students' appreciation of literature, also emphasized a critical discussion of each narrator's delivery and urged students "to prepare a dramatic or other type of reading in class, to practice it before a group, and then to record it on a disk or tape or wire recorder" (8-9). The *production* of new forms of public speech, then, clearly underwrote the use of spoken word recordings in educational contexts in the postwar era, largely on the level of the political unconscious.

By 1956, one of the institutions at the center of the American educational system responded to conditions of a shifting media ecology in which listening was supplementing reading. The *Second Yale Conference on the Teaching of English* focused in large part on the teaching of poetry within a changing media ecology in which students were being lured away from literacy by the siren call of the postwar mass media. A key part of the Yale Report involved a critique of the passive inscriptions of mass culture. As outlined by the Committee:

> We are dealing, to a large extent, with a generation which is not so much illiterate as alliterate; not so much anti-intellectual as non-intellectual. We are dealing with what has become a group of passive readers, who are exposed to, influenced by, and often corrupted by, the language they face daily, with, too often, no concept of the effects wrought upon themselves, or the means by which these effects are engineered. Besieged by advertisements, surrounded by the kind of jargon A. P. Herbert calls 'Jungle English', stupified by endless radio and TV exhortations, they do not know what they face; they sit like vegetables in front of their sets, or magazines, and absorb what is offered, good or bad, with only rudimentary notions of which is which. (2)

As well as the passivity that was being produced by the new language machines, which were changing the postwar media ecology in dramatic ways, educators were responding to an appropriation of poetic or figurative language for rhetorical purposes within the larger culture during the Cold War era.[13] However, the first concern of the Committee was interrupting the process by which the postwar generation was being passively inscribed by radio and TV as instruments of mass communication as well as the visual hail of commercial regimes of visual mass media.

Interestingly, the Report framed the phenomenon of listening as a supplement to reading in relation to the discourse of commerce as it related to publishing culture and to the Caedmon enterprise in particular. The Report began by noting somewhat dissonantly: "Poetry is not a fast-moving commodity in the world of contemporary letters. Few magazines buy it any longer; of the relatively few books of poetry that are published, fewer make any money for the publisher, or poet" (1). In contrast to this freezing of print publishing, the Committee noted the success of a spoken word company started by two unnamed young female graduates from Hunter College. Indeed, it went so far as to cite a recent article in *Good Housekeeping* entitled "They've Sold a Million Dollars Worth of Other People's Poetry," perhaps ironically, before noting: "The poets represented [in their catalogue] include Dylan Thomas, Ogden Nash, the Sitwells, e.e. cummings—and the range covers the field of poetry, from Homer in the original Greek to the most modern poet to be labelled 'obscure'" (1). The Report was somewhat ambivalent about the role of spoken word recordings in a changing media ecology that was characterized a shift from reading to listening, however. Indeed, in the entire Report only one sentence actively advocated the actual use of such recordings in classroom contexts.

Instead, a key part of the Committee's Report focused on the production of an "active reader" and the role of poetry a program of active reading as an alternative to passive listening. Essentially, the Report framed listening as passive and feminine and reading, including reading aloud, as active and masculine. Using the overtly sexist language that framed the high/low dichotomy in 1950s cultural discourse, the Report used gendered language that advocated the production of "an aggressive reader," indeed almost a rapacious one, "who brings all his faculties to bear on the poem, and who uses his past experience to make the next poem yield more easily" (3). The Committee framed the necessity for producing active readers, and readers of poetry in particular, in the face of the degradation of public language and inscription machines of secondary orality. Against the degradation of poetic language, the Committee outlined a program of active reading supplemented by educational aids such as the new anthologies and reader's encyclopedias.

Much of the Report detailed the use of relatively traditional techniques of explicating poetry to students. However, reading aloud formed a key emphasis of the Committee's recommendations. Reading aloud was active in that while reading and internalizing a text in the Greek sense, students also produced speech instead of being passively inscribed by speech machines. In effect reading aloud and memorization—once a feature of late nineteenth and early twentieth-century curriculum—was advocated in the service of retaining productive vocal power within the context of a changing mediasphere in which language machines were passively inscribing the young. Programs of active reading aloud in this sense supplemented writing as a form of subjectivity and essentially functioned to counter the objectifying power of mass media. In effect, the Yale Report was organized around the semiotics of affect—or a proto-psychological discourse—as this related to matrices of primary and secondary o/aurality and the objectifying and productive or performative power of postwar mass media. Spoken word recordings were effectively a kind of liminal genre that negotiated between a print mediasphere and the postmodern mediasphere based on technologized vocal inscription as a supplement to print—not entirely to the Committee's satisfaction.

Underlying the rhetorical context in which all these articles and reports were written is the response of educators to the sense-differentiated medium of radio as a language machine and a competing system of cultural, educational, and ideological inscription. Much of the discourse on recordings of *read texts* and *spoken texts* was written in the context of the postwar discourse on the educational use of that medium. The 1949 UNESCO document *Education by Radio* as authored by Roger Clausse, is perhaps the pre-eminent document of its type. As outlined by Clausse:

> Broadcast readings from literature, lacking the support of mime, gesture, physical presence and setting, demand perfect comprehension of the text reflected in the voice.
>
> The complete absence of the physical elements, which are of such assistance in creating a receptive atmosphere, requires the broadcaster to make up for their absence by an added effort of understanding and expression. It may be said with truth that readings from literature are a tour de force demanding perfect knowledge of the resources of the microphone coupled with an appreciation of the underlying intentions of the author, a profound understanding of the text. Here the slightest shade of tone is of importance, for, despite appearances, the microphone not is faithful interpreter [sic]; it takes hold of your words and can turn them into ridicule.

> What are wanted are the rare virtues of restraint, self-effacement behind the text, delicate shades of meaning, appropriate intonation and calculated effects; the voice and interpretation alone must put into the reading all the implications which gesture and mime convey so eloquently before an audience. The hearers must be brought to feel, without effort or loud striving, the underlying thought and hidden feelings of the writer. Broadcast literary readings are not proclamations but confidences. (38)

The aesthetic described by Clausse and rendered in a rhetoric of high affect that revealed the political imperative or ideology of secondary orality would become dominant in the postwar period. This emphasis on affect was essentially a dialectical response by the liberal democracies to the overtly propagandistic disposition of fascist radio. It conditioned the disposition of postmodern media systems, including postmodern poetry systems, and conditioned the production of *spoken texts* in particular.

As the imprint of Clausse's publication demonstrates, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization was in many ways the institutional and discursive machine behind of the shift from print to mass communication and post print mass media as the scene of the postmodern. This institution produced the foundational philosophical discourse that produced postwar mass culture as well as producing the legal discourse within which it circulated as a material culture.

An early emphasis of UNESCO was the "normalization" of the systems in formerly fascist and fascist-occupied countries. That agenda was articulated the most clearly in 1947 in *Press, Radio, Film,* and the series of supplements that were published in 1948 and 1949, which effectively became the first of UNESCO's papers in mass communications and mass media. The first of these, *The Report of the Commission on Technical Needs in Press Radio Film,* justified the necessity for UNESCO's intervention in the circulation and global mediation of information, art, culture and scientific knowledge as follows:

> The Constitution of Unesco states in the preamble that "The Governments of the States parties to this Constitution on behalf of their people's declare, that since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that

> the defences of peace must be constructed; that ignorance of each other's ways and lives has been a common cause, throughout the history of mankind of that suspicion and mistrust between the peoples of the world through which their differences have all too often broken into war . . . . For these reasons, the States parties to this Constitution, believing in full and equal opportunities for education for all, in the unrestricted pursuit of objective education for all, in the unrestricted pursuit of objective truth, and in the free exchange of ideas and knowledge, are agreed and determined to develop and to increase the means for te [sic] purposes of mutual understanding and a truer and more perfect knowledge of each other's lives . . . . (5)

The discourse of the post-print humanities and postwar mass culture was essentially materialized within the institutional and discursive matrix of UNESCO as an institution that advocated education for all and the unrestricted "exchange of ideas and knowledge." To that end, the first Report also recommended what international agreements might be necessary "to promote the free flow of ideas by word and image" (5). These agreements effectively produced the framework within which that discourse—the postmodern humanities and the postmodern fine and liberal arts—first materialized as supplements to modern media and modern culture.

In addition to re-establishing the media systems of war-torn countries and ideological apparatuses as had been wracked by wartime disruption, UNESCO's series of papers in mass media and mass communication effectively proposed to rectify the polarized media systems of the prewar period, in which the liberal democracies remained tied to print as a medium of cultural, educational and ideological inscription (as supplemented by culture and internalized taste regimes) while the fascist countries favored mass culture and more "modern" forms of media, including film and radio. Essentially, UNESCO attempted to rectify the conditions that had allowed for the dissemination of fascist ideas in non-print media as the most toxic expression of nationalistic anti-Enlightenment and anti-humanist thought. Culture and knowledge effectively became the utopian content of post print media and post print media systems during the postwar period because of positions elaborated in the series of foundational documents on the "proper" ideological uses of mass media and mass communication that were published by UNESCO, and because of UNESCO promoted the dissemination of such mass-mediated educational, scientific and cultural materials on a global scale.

As subsequently codified in the 1951 UNESCO publication *Trade Barriers to Knowledge*, among other materials those agreements pertained to the free circulation of books, newsprint, periodicals, manuscripts, printed music, maps and charts, original works of art, including original paintings and drawings, statuary, collections of scientific interest, scientific instruments and apparatus, and materials for the blind; they also included visual and auditory materials in the form of film, filmstrips, microfilm, radio receivers and sound recordings (17-18). These definitions would turn out to be quite broad. The Orson Welles' *MacBeth,* produced at Western studios, for example, enjoyed global distribution as educational material under these agreements because it was disseminated in the 16-mm filmstrip medium as an "educational" medium. Significantly, film and sound recordings were the first forms of post-print media to circulate without tariffs. These predated international print networks, in the form of international cultural and educational journals. Radio also preceded the establishment of international print networks.[14]

The postwar postmodern, then, was fundamentally a moment in the history of post print media in which media of sound and image reproduction, audiovisual mass media, and electronic media of mass communication were harnessed in the service of mass education and the international exchange of culture and knowledge. In this way, the field of education as a program of ideological inscription and the mass culture industry were synthesized into a new hybridized form of post print educational mass media as a supplement to formal education. This mass-mediated educational supplement was essentially "the scene of the postmodern." The emergence of postwar mass culture was both discursively and institutionally mediated rather than technologically determined. UNESCO underwrote much of its legitimacy or political morality.

While UNESCO was underwritten by a utopian neo-humanist discourse, the founding rhetoric of that organization also emphasized free trade as the foundation of the modern liberal state and less explicitly of a modern liberal economy. The postwar reconsolidation of this necessarily ideological element of liberalism as a political and economic system was also historicized in *Trade Barriers to Knowledge* as a supplement to the *Film, Press, Radio* series. That publication began by historicizing how a period of free trade in ideas and liberalization of tariffs governing the international circulation of books had originated with the general free trade movement that dated back to 1850 and proceeded to detail the role that the gradual restriction of the free trade in intellectual materials had played in the rise of fascism and the outbreak of war.[15] Re-framed as such, the free trade in symbolic commodities was one of the foundations of the modern liberal state. Restoring this liberal free trade in ideas was a key platform of UNESCO as articulated in its earliest publications.

"Remedial action" on the part of UNESCO in the aftermath of the war resulted in various forms of intergovernmental agreements about the unrestricted global circulation what we might now recognize as ideological materials—in the most neutral sense of the word—in which the global was accorded the same status as the local and national and exempt from any form of tariff as it related to cultural, educational, or scientific materials (10). By 1946, six months before UNESCO was actually operating, mass communications experts were drafting out the series of intergovernmental agreements that would govern the globe's postwar and postmodern media ecology. By 1948, a preliminary agreement known as the Beirut Agreement, or the Agreement for Facilitating the International Circulation of Visual and Auditory Materials of an Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Character, which covered audio-visual materials such as films and sound recordings, had been signed (11). This agreement was broadened the following year under the aegis of a general trade agreement undertaken as part of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (or GATT), which secured an agreement to remove tariffs on radio receivers and to set up a working committee to consider printed publications (11). Those recommendations were codified in the 1951 UNESCO Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials. It is this liberal or free trade agreement that is the scene of the postmodern in the fullest sense as a form of political morality and as program of educational, cultural, and scientific exchange, largely in post-print mass media.

"An archeology of the present," to use Friedrich Kittler's resonant term, must ultimately account for the ways in which mid-century postwar media shift was imprinted with discourses of wartime as the liberal democracies turned to electronic secondary orality and to post print mass media in the service of promulgating democracy and capitalism. UNESCO's papers on mass media and mass communication represented the utopian aspect of the social aging of culture in wartime. In contrast, the USIA's turn to mass media and mass culture represented the ongoing politicization and even weaponization of American popular culture and American civilization in the ideological service of the once legitimate but now somewhat faded ideal of "Americanization" on a global scale. Archibald MacLeish, as an American public servant and minor poet, and the effective architect of the postwar postmodern, also connects these two very different "faces" of postwar mass culture. MacLeish was instrumental in actively materializing both of these faces through his positions in the OWI, the American State Department, and UNESCO and in effecting the translation of the voice of the poet into commodity-object form as an early facilitator of the Caedmon commercial recording enterprise.

Undoubtedly, the nature of MacLeish' contribution to American cultural history lies not in the nature of poetic and dramatic accomplishments but rather in his record of public service as an active liberal and humanist. From 1939 to 1944, MacLeish served as Librarian of Congress. It was he who founded the Library of Congress Recording Laboratory as an institutionalized initiative to record both American poets and American folk music (Falk 104). This appointment supplemented MacLeish's earlier direction of federal educational radio programs in the mid and late 1930s, as the head of the National Advisory Council on Radio and Education or NACRE, which included federal radio projects undertaken by poets, writers, and dramatists. Macleish also served as the Director of the Office of Facts and Figures as a defensive mobilization against the spread of fascism within America during a period that extended from 1941-1942 and as Assistant Director of the Office of War Information between 1942 and 1943 (Falk 100-104).

Throughout this period, MacLeish was a vigorous polemicist for democracy in books, print periodicals, in public addresses and over the airwaves.[16] MacLeish continued to serve the American government from 1944-1949. Most notably, MacLeish served as Assistant Secretary of State in charge of Cultural Affairs from 1944-1945. MacLeish was also the Chairman of the American delegation to found the United Nations and the first American member of the Executive Council of UNESCO (Ellis and Drabeck xxiv). For many years beforehand and indeed as early as 1936, MacLeish had also served as Chairman and editor in the planning stage for the groups that charted UNESCO (Falk 100).[17]

MacLeish continued to write poetry and stage and radio dramas throughout this period and after his appointment at Harvard as the Boylston Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory. However, far more important than these derivative and overtly polemical works was MacLeish's insight into the performative power of the spoken and written word as "an action upon this earth." MacLeish is at the heart of the project to politicize poetry and literature more generally in the prewar, wartime and postwar period. MacLeish' overt weaponization of books, words and ideas in the service of promulgating democracy is at the heart of the liberal-democratic response to Nazi *Kulturewaffen,* and has been read by present historians such as Greg Horten—as indeed it was by many of MacLeish's contemporaries—as "propaganda." That recognition of the performative power of language accorded the written or spoken word more power than an actual weapon—and a productive power that equaled if not surpassed its destructive power. That realization was at the heart of the liberal democratic mobilization against fascism, and indeed the logocentrism of the postwar postmodern.

While the production of postmodern universal "mass culture" is imprinted with the dialectic of utopia and reification, it is important to acknowledge that the proliferating media systems of the postwar era were also imprinted to different degrees with an antifascist political unconscious. This was particularly true of the LP as a medium that originated in the OWI during wartime. The disposition of the LP reflected a dialogue between Europe and America, particularly as it related to the democratization of the media systems of formerly fascist European countries, even as the LP was also deployed more problematically in the service of electronic presence in the postwar period on a global scale. In many ways, the disposition of the monaural LP as a popular commodity was shaped by the legacy of wartime listening formations and wartime reading formations as shaped by cultural or ideological warfare in the European context. This program of cultural inscription was part of the ongoing "Europeanization" of America in the postwar period. In our own cultural moment, the symbolic reversal of vinylite spoken word inscription that is so much a part of contemporary hip-hop culture clearly represents an ongoing ritualized reversal of the disposition of the monaural LP and the cultural excisions and symbolic violence of postwar "universal" culture as well as a radical return of spoken word and the culture of orality as the "content" of voice and sound recording and reproduction.

The historical publishing formation that I label the postwar postmodern was also the ground of an avant-garde postmodernism recognized as such, as this emerged in the 1970s. This historically situated avant-garde defamiliarized technologies of voice transmission and vocal reproduction or secondary spoken word performance and indeed all technologies of (mass) cultural transmission, (mass) cultural reproduction, and (mass) cultural inscription. These defamiliarizing aesthetic practices based largely on a postmodernist performance art effectively supplemented the ideology-critique that began to be articulated in European contexts in the early and mid 1960s and specifically the poststructuralist project initiated by Louis Althusser, Michel Foucault, Roland Barthes, and Jacques Derrida among other key figures.

A performance art piece by Raymond Federman was one of the foundational American performance events that attempted to "liberate" literary texts from a certain ideological recuperation in the service of a political and economic agenda. Federman's Derridean-influenced "Voices Within Voices" was first mounted as part of an International Symposium on Post-Modern Performance at the Center for Twentieth Century Studies at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee in November 1976, and can be taken for a wider postmodernist art-practice that dates from this period. Federman's performance featured film slides in which photographs of manuscripts were "pulverized" into collages, and a layered four-track recorded performance of Federman's voiced performance of texts, which was multiplied and proliferated into a superimposed "chorus" of voices in both English and French, which essentially functionally to destabilize reified author cult. Liberating the multiple voices within the text involved a return to postmodern mass media, as a supplement to the reified printed text, within the context of an explicitly postmodernist performance art-practice that destabilized and desacralized photographic reproductions of the manuscript as an effect of author cult and the cult of postwar secondary orality.

In a published explication about that performance, Federman suggested that it was committed to a process of cancellation or annulling "written texts—poems/fictions—pregnant with signification" (379). Federman's performance was dependent on his multi-voiced sounded performance of his own written works and on the multiplication and the blurring of his own voice in particular as part of a process of "decomposing written texts—poems/fictions—already organized into a form a structure a syntax" (380). Federman radically stylized his written text in order to "destructure words in their syntactical unity by dissemination" and through "oral/visual dislocation" in a way that invoked sound and image regimes, including regimes of *read text* performance and regimes of secondary orality. Federman suggested that his performance practice was informed by a process of repetition which was underwritten by "an attempt to prevent unity of presence" and by a process of "self-pla(y)giarization," a description that invokes artifacts of author cult as disseminated in media of secondary orality (380-1). Federman's performance practice was explicitly postmodernist in a way that clearly related to destabilizing regimes of signification and regimes of mediation. Like so much of Derrida's critique of presence and Logos, Federman's description is haunted by the discourse of high fidelity and audio engineering in particular.

The use of secondary voice technologies—and audiotape in particular—was particularly essential to early postmodernist art practice as a destabilizing of postmodern mass culture. In his own words, Federman effectively "play-giarized" his text in part:

> to demystify the sacrosanct name of the author and not vice versa
> to desacralize the origin of the text and not vice versa
> to remove the authorial voice from the center of the text and not vice versa
> to perform on the text a syntactical deconstruction and not vice versa

> to liberate language from its discursiveness and not vice versa
> to suspend the will of economic communication and not vice versa
> to perturb the logic of ratiocination and not vice versa
> to place attentiveness on the form of the message and not vice versa
> to release the impetuousness language has for dissoluteness and not vice versa
> to dismember the unity of presence in the text and not vice versa
> (382)

While Federman proposed this sounded oral/visual art-play as a response to the fixing of the text in typographical media, he posited postmodernist verbal performance art practices not only against the typesetting of the poem in print media but implicitly at least against industrially-produced heavily edited "modern" voice documents of the type published by Caedmon and other publishers of the spoken word as engineered in magnetic audiotape during "the LP moment."

Federman's early intervention rested on a binary distinction between the modern and the postmodern that I have not repeated here. Essentially, what Federman posited as postmodern, I posit as postmodernist. Throughout this dissertation, I have posited modern/postmodern and modernist/postmodernist as historically discontinuous but semantically parallel terms in a way that avoids the supposedly different engagements of modernism and postmodernism with mass culture. As I have framed it throughout this dissertation, the scene of the postmodern in contrast as a supplement to the modern involves 1) the appropriation of popular mass media in the service of disseminating the legacy of modern literature and culture, including modern theater; 2) the turn to post-print or postmodern mass media as a technology of cultural, educational, and ideological inscription; and 3) the universal or post and paranational dissemination of such media via various postmodern media delivery systems including electronic mass media and postmodern and mass-mediated systems of cultural and educational exchange as mandated most notably by UNESCO. The postmodern is the post print and para or postnational supplement to the project of the modern, including the project of modern literacy. It was deployed in the service of a political agenda—the postmodern liberal democracy—and also in the service of capital. Modernist and postmodernist art practices alike, then, intervened in that fundamentally ideological project and functioned to destabilize the modern and postmodern appropriation of art in the service of ideology.

As an example of universally distributed author cult in secondary voice media, Caedmon and other voice publishers would seem to be critiqued by Federman's own performance. However, one needs to understand the production of these postmodern voice documents and the ideology of postwar secondary orality—or more accurately secondary literacy—in all of its historicity. These *read text* voice documents were both the ground of postmodernist art practices as such and a dialectical response to the Nazi attack on culture, art, and on the book and alphabetical media as part of the political unconscious of media in the postwar or postmodern era. I have framed the postmodern as a historical synthesis of politically polarized prewar media systems. In reframing postwar mass culture and the decade of secondary orality more narrowly as the scene of the postwar postmodern, I am also implicitly working within a certain tradition of defining and historicizing the trauma of the modern that sees the defining culmination of the history of the modern and modernity not in terms of the prison or the asylum—as suggested by Michel Foucault—but rather of the concentration camp (Giorgio Agemben as cited in Burt 317). This definition allows for not only the political but equally if not more importantly the moral legitimacy of "universal" culture in the postwar period. It also accounts for the apotheosis of the writer—and also the theatrical actor, the dancer, the painter, and the musician—as a "culture hero" in the postwar era. This apotheosis was part of the revitalizing of the humanizing and liberalizing arts in the postwar period—and the "democratization" of those arts in postwar mass media as the scene of postwar "mass culture" as part of the political unconscious of postwar media systems.

Clearly, the Caedmon enterprise was also influenced—if only on the level of the political unconscious—by the imperative to answer Pound as the most influential and technically accomplished poet of the twentieth century. As published by Caedmon, the spoken word LP was utopian, then, in its aspect as mass education and mass communication to the degree that continually responded to Pound while simultaneously containing his message as part of the wider rehabilitation of literary modernism during the postwar period. It is true that the LP and the post modern mediasphere more generally did not achieve a utopian ideal of educational and cultural exchange as mandated by UNESCO, and to the degree that such exchange was achieved it was deeply imbricated with an ideological supplement. It is also true that the utopian impulse of the spoken word LP become reified, discursive, and even culturally oppressive—particularly as shaped by the extra-literary aesthetic contingencies of value, or forms of linguistic hegemony, that constrained the practice of public speech during this moment of media shift, which effectively silenced many primary spoken word cultures and subcultures. Whether or not the utopian impulse of the spoken word LP was made manifest in the larger culture is not the subject of this dissertation. Fundamentally, this dissertation has attempted only to recognize that impulse in all of its historical and techno-material specificity.

However, at least some of Caedmon's young audience responded to the record company's implicit incitement to them to "sing something." Central to my argument that Caedmon Records is at the scene of the postmodern is the idea that American record companies were in some sense a postmodern supplement to the project of modern print publishing, as it related to the dissemination of modern poetry in particular. The fact that the second poet of the Vinyl Age, Bob Dylan, took the name of its first, Dylan Thomas, as his own patronymic, testifies to this moment of intermedia. It is this second, resurrected Dylan who synthesized the cultural legacy of the Caedmon and the Folkways catalogues as part of the social aging of culture in wartime and part of the political unconscious of the LP medium. Arguably, it is this second Dylan who responded to Caedmon's injunction to sing the written word, and who in the process also returned poetry to the realm of song. It is also the second Dylan who brought the Cold War Reading Crusade to a close by singing what it had repressed—in the form of the blues and subaltern "folkways" more generally. Arguably, it is he—along with Allen Ginsberg—who "redeemed" the counter-culture impulse in Dylan Thomas' own voice practice.

While Caedmon was at the center of postwar mass culture, then, there are some fairly direct links between postwar mass culture and 1960s counter-culture. The legacy of the Caedmon *read text* archive also underwent a second life as the content of a vinylite counter-culture, as set to music in the 1970s, in the form of many of the most accomplished and literary songwriters of that era, who were as varied as Patti Smith and Leonard Cohen. That this generation of poets responded primarily in song—and not on the printed page—suggests that they, like Bobby Zimmerman, who was the son of a Minnesota electronics store owner, heard and responded to Caedmon's incitement to sing "something" during another moment of intermedia when poetry left the printed page and was inscribed into the record groove. This, too, was part of the legacy of the scene of the postmodern—and the postwar "democratization" of poetry.

NOTES

[1] Clearly, the semiotics of *jouissance* that Roland Barthes employs in his essay "The Grain of the Voice" explicitly echo this discourse.

[2] Harry T. Moore, "Poetry on Records." *Poetry*, September 1949, p. 367.

[3] Harry T. Moore, "Poetry on Records." *Poetry*, March 1952, p. 353.

[4] Cummings exhibits a particularly anglophile linguistic self-fashioning. He also uses the hypostatized slow tempo much valorized in the postwar period, which was often closely related to the fetishizing of measure.

[5] "The Spoken Word." *The Saturday Review*, Nov. 29 1952, p. 68. Edman was a Professor of Philosophy at Columbia University who would subsequently compile a commercial 12-disc set of spoken word recordings for Columbia Records in 1953.

[6] "Words, Words, Words." *The Saturday Review*, May 2 1956, p. 60.

[7] John Ciardi, "Six Hours of Dylan Thomas." *The Saturday Review*, Nov. 4 1958, p. 50.

[8] John Ciardi, "Seniors and Juniors," *The Saturday Review*, June 11, 1969, p. 42-43.

[9] *The Saturday Review*, Dec. 29, 1962, p. 52.

[10] John Ciardi was also an astute observer of the political unconscious of postwar LPs and theatrical recordings. Seemingly anticipating Alan Williams' framing of sound reproduction as a kind of aural fantasy—but in a more tongue-in-cheek mode of self-reflexively "ironic" midcult commentary, Ciardi noted of a 1965 Caedmon TRS production of George Bernard Shaw's *Caesar and Cleopatra*: "The Theatre Recording Society is, of course, an enthusiastic illusion factory, and though the drama critic from *Pravda* might score the fluffiness of the action as bourgeois, everyone else I can think of should be happy with it, and I certainly am." "All the Nile's A Stage," *The Saturday Review of Literature*, September 11, 1965, p. 60.

[11] "Let the Record Speak," *The English Journal*, March 1952, p. 147.

[12] This broader elocutionary imperative also appears to have shaped the speech-centered commentary about spoken word records that was produced in popular periodicals such as *The Saturday Review*. In a 1957 review of Lloyd Frankenberg's *A Round of Poems*, for example, Ciardi chastised the foundational print anthologist for a reading that "in the manner of a City College Speech Major." The rhetoric of distinction meant that spoken word performances must must not be seem to be discursive or elocutionary. "Writers as Reader's of Poetry." *The Saturday Review*, Nov. 23, 1957, p. 32.

[13] A key part of the Report involved its discourse on a changing media ecology as this related to image and sound "regimes" as supplements to print and on the larger appropriation of poetic language in all media modalities. As framed by the Committee, these involved the degradation of language and the appropriation of figurative language in particular – not only by the advertising industry but also in the service of a political rhetoric. Many of the examples of figurative language given derive from the convoluted anti-Communist propaganda of news magazines such as *Time*; the report of the mushroom-like atomic cloud that was raised at Alamogordo, New Mexico, in 1945 is also prominently featured. The Committee's turn to a process of decoding figurative language was thus prompted by the critical imperative of reading the use poetic language critically in the context of its use in everyday life. This contingency of value could not

have been more antithetical to the New Criticism as the dominant interpretive apparatus of its day; indeed, a large part of the Report seemed to involve an indirect critique of the New Criticism as an interpretive apparatus from an educational or social standpoint. The Yale Report effectively abandoned the project of the New Criticism in that it ceded the necessity of educators to negotiate a position between what it called the "Scylla of subjectivity," or subjective interpretations of poetry, and the "Charbybdis of technical terminology" or a reified excessively formalist interpretation because of what is at stake in the teaching of poetry—particularly in the context of what it saw as a public language degraded by political rhetoric and the discourse of advertising(1). However, even as it was concerned with the degradation of public language in the service of commercial and political objectives, the primary focus of Yale Report was larger media shift from print to technologies of vocal inscription.

[14]Radio in particular as a medium of mass communication was harnessed as an instrument of mass education as the liberal democracies reconsolidated both nationally and internationally around postmodern mass media. Each of the three sub-commissions UNESCO assigned to report on postwar needs in press and news or newsprint agencies; the radio and film sub-commissions made particular recommendations. The first report, published in 1947, the year UNESCO was founded, recommended an expenditure of over 16 million dollars in radio education, and was the only committee to frame needs in terms of (U.S.) dollars. Interestingly, the lion's share, some 75%, was targeted at three countries—Poland, Yugoslavia and China—that were then under communist influence or under the threat of communist influence (32-35). A great amount of this money was allocated for the purchase of receiving sets. By 1949, in its second Report, the Commission on Technical Needs had elaborated principles of education by radio, the use of radio in the context of school and university education, and towards the development of a "general culture" (52-54). It also advocated a general policy regarding "the provision of a great number of receiving sets in economically weak countries" (58) and increased radio networking, including short wave networking (60). While individuals associated with UNESCO imagined that the organization might start its own utopian radio network dedicated to international communication, short wave radio ultimately reached its fullest expression in the electronic warfare of the postwar period as a technology that penetrated national space as a key element of campaigns of international informational and ideological or cultural warfare as a supplement to state broadcasting.

[15] According that publication, a specific free trade agreement relating to the free trade in book dated back to an 1860 agreement signed by France and Britain (9). That agreement endured despite a protectionist turn that restricted trade in general over the next twenty years. France even extended its tariff exemptions in 1892 to cover books from any country of origin; other countries such as Italy, Russia, Spain and the United States allowed for free trade in foreign language materials but imposed a duty on books written in their own languages. As noted by the Report, the First World War brought restrictions to the golden era of free trade in ideas. By the 1930s, a rigorously protectionist atmosphere prevailed regarding the import of all commodities, including those that were symbolic or ideological in nature (10).

[16] During this period, MacLeish addressed the American Society of Newspaper Editors, the members of the Associated Press, the American Library Association, and the American Booksellers Association among many other bodies. His periodical publications in a similar period appeared in venues that ranged from *Stage, Vogue, Furioso, Atlantic, Library Journal, McCalls, Saturday Evening Post, New York Times, Nation, Saturday Review of Literature,* and *New Republic.* I have already alluded to some of MacLeish' many engagements with radio. Among other accomplishments in this medium, MacLeish is widely believed to have written President' Roosevelt's fireside chats (Falk 101).

[17] See "UNESCO's Task," *American Association of University Professors' Bulletin* 32 (December 1936), pp. 605-609.

Bibliography

Primary Sources:

Personal Interviews:
Bartók, Peter. Taped personal interview. 5 Feb. 1998.
Holdridge, Barbara, and Mantell, Marianne. Joint personal interview. 27 Oct. 1997.
Holdridge, Barbara. Taped personal interview. 5 Aug. 2001.
Mantell, Marianne. Taped personal interview. 25 & 27 May 2002.

Public Lectures:
Mantell, Marianne. "Life and Times: Fifty Years of Caedmon Records." *Toronto International Writers' Festival*, Harbourfront Centre, Toronto, 2 Nov. 2002.

Papers:
Working Business Records
Harper Audio, Harper Collins, New York, NY

Court Proceedings:
Holdridge, Mantell et. al. vs. Raytheon Company, D.C. Heath and Company, Caedmon Records. 75 Civ. 5066 LPG and 75 Civ. 3727. US District Court Southern District of New York. 1975.

Secondary Sources:

Ackerman, John. *Dylan Thomas: His Life and Work.* London: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Ackroyd, Peter. *T.S. Eliot*. London: Hamish Hamilton, 1984.

Althusser, Louis. "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses." *Essays on Ideology.* London: Verso, 1984.

Altman, Rick (Ed.). *Sound Theory Sound Practice*. New York: Routledge, 1992.

Anderegg, Michael. *Orson Welles, Shakespeare and Popular Culture*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.

Anghelescu, Hermina G. G. and Poulain, Martine (Eds.). *Books, Libraries, Reading, and Publishing in the Cold War.* Washington: Library of Congress The Center for the Book, 2001.

Azadovskii, Konstantin, and Egorov, Boris. "From Anti-Westernism to Anti-Semitism: Stalin and the Impact of the 'Anti-Cosmopolitan' Campaigns on Soviet Culture." *Journal of Cold War Studies* 4.1 (2002): 66-80.

Barthes, Roland. “The Grain of the Voice.” *Image-Music-Text*. Trans. Stephen Heath. New York: Hill and Wang, 179-189.

---. “Listening.” *The Responsibility of Forms: Critical Essays on Music, Art, and Representation*. Trans. Richard Howard. New York: Hill and Wang. 1985.

Bartók, Peter. “It’s All in the Groove.” *The Nation*. 4 Dec. 1954: 484-485.

Baudrillard, Jean. *Simulacra and Simulation*. Trans. Sheila Faria Glaser. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1994.

Benjamin, Walter. “The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction.” Trans. Harry Zohn. *Illuminations*. Ed. Hannah Arrendt. New York: Schocken Books, 1968 (1936).

Bernal, Martin. *Black Athena: The Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilization. Vol. 1: The Fabrication of Ancient Greece 1785-1985*. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1987.

Bernstein, Charles (Ed.). *Close Listening: Poetry and the Performed Word.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Bernstein, Julius C. “Recording and Playback Machines: Their Function in the English Classroom.” *The English Journal: An Official Organ of the National Council of Teachers of English*. June 1949: 330-42.

Blum, Robert (Ed). *Cultural Affairs and Foreign Relations.* Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1963.

Bogart, Leo. *Premises for Propaganda: The United States Information Agency’s Operating Assumptions in the Cold War*. New York: The Free Press, 1976.

“Books Banned in Utica.” *The New York Times*. 14 Oct. 1953: 81.

“Book Burners are Assailed by President at Dartmouth.” *The New York Times*. 15 June 1953: 1.

Boose, Lynda E. and Burt, Richard. *Shakespeare: The Movie*. New York: Routledge, 1997.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *The Field of Cultural Production.* Trans. Randall Johnson. New York: Columbia University Press, 1993.

---. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Trans. Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson. Ed. John B. Thompson. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991.

---. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste.* Trans. Richard Nice. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984.

Bowra, Maurice. *Edith Sitwell.* Monaco: The Lyrebird Press, 1947.

Boyd, James. *The Free Company Presents: A Collection of Plays About the Meaning of America.* New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1941.

Boyle, Kay. "A Declaration for 1955." *Words That Somehow Must Be Said.* San Francisco: North Point Press, 1985.

Brady, Frank. *Citizen Welles: A Biography of Orson Welles.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1989.

"Branding of Books Stirs Texas Battle." *The New York Times.* 7 June 1953: 61.

Breslin, James E.B. *From Modern to Contemporary: American Poetry, 1945-1965.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1983.

Brinnin, John Malcolm. *Dylan Thomas in America.* Boston: Little, Brown & Company, 1955.

Broderick, Gertrude G. "Radio and Recordings as Aids to Teaching." *School Life: Office Journal of the Office of Education, Federal Security Agency.* April 1952: 104+.

Brophy, James D. *Edith Sitwell: The Symbolist Order.* Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1968.

Brunner, Edward. *Cold War Poetry.* Chicago: The University of Illinois Press, 2001.

Bull, Malcolm. "Between the Cultures of Capital." *The New Left Review* 11 (Sept/Oct. 2001): 95-113.

Burt, Richard (Ed.) *Shakespeare After Mass Media.* New York: Palgrave, 2002.

Callaghan, North. *Carl Sandburg: Lincoln of Our Literature.* New York: New York University Press, 1970.

Canby, Edward Tatnell. "The Harvard Poetry Recordings." *The Saturday Review.* 31 May 1947: 34.

---. "The New Recordings: The Spoken Word on Records." *Harper's.* Oct. 1954: 110-12.

Ciardi, John. "Writers as Readers of Poetry." *The Saturday Review.* 23 Nov. 1957:

32.

---. "Six Hours of Dylan Thomas." *The Saturday Review*. 15 Nov. 1958:50.

---. "Actors as Readers." *The Saturday Review*. 30 May 1959: 39.

---. "Irish Writers and Readers." *The Saturday Review*. 31 Oct. 1959: 50.

---. "Seniors and Juniors." *The Saturday Review*. 11 June 1960: 42-3.

---. "All the Nile's A Stage." *The Saturday Review*. 11 Sept. 1965: 60.

Clause, Roger. *Education by Radio: School Broadcasting*. Press, Film and Radio in the World Today. Paris: UNESCO, 1949.

"Cleveland Shops Drop Freud Book." *The New York Times*. 7 Mar. 1953: 17.

Cohen, Hennig (Ed.) *Landmarks of American Writing*. New York: Basic Books, 1969.

"Columbia's Challenge." *Newsweek*. 28 June 1948: 82-83.

Council of Books During Wartime. *A History of the Council of Books During Wartime, 1942-1946*. New York: Country Life Press, 1946.

Cowell, Henry. "Shaping Music for Total War." *Modern Music* 22.4 (May-June, 1945) 223-226.

Crossley-Holland, Kevin (Ed. & Trans.). *The Anglo-Saxon World*. Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 1984.

"Cultural Group Rebukes Miller." *The New York Times*. 14 Feb. 1956: 5.

Davidson, Michael. *Ghostlier Demarcations: Modern Poetry and the Material Word.* Berkeley: The University of California Press, 1997.

Davies, Tony. *Humanism.* London: Routledge, 1997.

DeBray, Régis. *Teachers, Writers, Celebrities: The Intellectuals of Modern France.* Trans. David Macey. London: NLB, 1979.

---. *Media Manifestos: On the Technological Transmission of Cultural Forms.* London: Verso, 1996.

---. *Transmitting Culture.* Trans. Eric Rauth. New York: Columbia University Press, 1997.

Dewey, John and Kallen, Horace M. (Eds.). *The Bertrand Russell Case*. Di Capo Press 1972 (1941).

Diepeveen, Leonard. *Changing Voices: The Modern Quoting Poem.* Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1993.

Dizzard, Wilson P. *The Strategy of Truth: The Story of the U.S. Information Service.* Washington, DC: The Public Affairs Press, 1961.

Doob, Leonard W. (Ed.) *"Ezra Pound Speaking": Radio Speeches of World War II.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1978.

Douglas, Ann. "Periodicizing the American Century: Modernism, Postmodernism, and Postcolonialism in the Cold War Context." *Modernism/Modernity* 5.3 (1998): 71-98.

Durand, Régis. "The Disposition of the Voice." *Performance in Postmodern Culture*. Eds. Michel Benamou and Charles Caramello. Madison: University of Wisconsin/Coda Press, 1977.

Eargle, John. *Sound Recording* (2nd Ed.) New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1980.

Easthope, Anthony. *Poetry as Discourse*. New York: Methuen, 1983.

Edman, Irwin. "The Spoken Word." *The Saturday Review*. 29 Nov. 1952: 68-9.

Eisenstein, Elizabeth. *The Printing Revolution in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

---. *Print Culture and Enlightenment Thought*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina, 1986.

Ellis, Helen E. and Drabeck, Bernard A. *Archibald MacLeish: A Selectively Annotated Bibliography*. Lanham, MD: The Scarecrow Press, 1995.

Engelman, Ralph. *Public Radio and Television in America: A Political History.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1996.

Epstein, Jason. *Book Business: Publishing Past Present and Future.* New York: W. W. Norton, 2001.

Falk, Signi Lenea. *Archibald MacLeish.* New York: Twayne Publishers, 1965.

Federman, Raymond. "Voices Within Voices." *Text-Sound Texts*. Ed. Richard Kostelanetz. New York: William Morrow & Co., 1980: 379-382.

Fein, Seth. "Everyday Forms of Transnational Collaboration: U.S. Film Propaganda in Cold War Mexico." *Close Encounters of Empire: Writing the Cultural History of U.S.-Latin American Relations*. Eds. Gilbert M. Joseph, Catherine C. LeGrand, and Ricardo D. Salvatore. Durham: Duke University Press, 1998.

Fejes, Fred. *Imperialism, Media, and the Good Neighbor: New Deal Foreign Policy and United States Shortwave Broadcasting to Latin America*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing, 1986.

Ferris, Paul. *Dylan Thomas*. London: Hodder and Stroughton, 1977.

---. (Ed.). *The Collected Letters of Dylan Thomas*. London: J.M. Dent and Sons, 1985.

Finch, Annie. *The Ghost of Meter: Culture and Prosody in American Free Verse*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan, 1997.

Fischer, Margaret. *Ezra Pound's Radio Operas: The BBC Experiments, 1931-1933*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2002.

Foerster, Norman. *The Humanities and the Common Man: The Democratic Role of the State Universities*. Chapel Hill: The University of Carolina Press, 1946.

---. (Ed.) *The Humanities After the War*. Freeport, NY: Books for Libraries Press, 1969. (1944)

Fussell, Paul. *Wartime: Understanding and Behavior in the Second World War*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Frankenberg, Lloyd. *Pleasure Dome: On Reading Modern Poetry*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1949.

Fryer, Jonathan. *Dylan: The Nine Lives of Dylan Thomas*. London: Kyle Cathie Ltd., 1993.

Gelatt, Roland. *The Fabulous Phonograph: From Tin Foil to High Fidelity*. J.P. Lippincott Co., 1954.

Genette, Gérard. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Trans. Jane E. Lewin. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Gerogiannis, Nicholas (Ed.). *Ernest Hemingway: Complete Poems*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1979.

Gielgud, John. *Shakespeare: Hit or Miss?* London: Sigwick & Jackson, 1991.

Gittens, Rob. *The Last Days of Dylan Thomas*. London: Macdonald & Company, 1986.

Glendinning, Victoria. *Edith Sitwell: A Unicorn Among the Lions*. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1981.

Goldberg, Irving J. "Let the Record Speak." *The English Journal.* March 1952: 147-150.

Goldstein, Sidney. "Aristocrats of the Turntable." *Library Journal.* 15 March 1949: 434-438.

Gordon, David M. (Ed.). *Ezra Pound and James Laughlin: Selected Letters*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1994.

Graeffe, Arnold Didier. *Creative Education in the Humanities*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951.

Greenberg, Clement. "Avant-Garde and Kitsch." *The Partisan Review* 6.5 (Fall 1939): 34-49.

Gronow, Pekka, and Saunio, Ilpo. *An International History of the Sound Recording Industry*. Trans. Christopher Moseley. New York: Cassell, 1998.

Guibault, Serge. *How New York Stole the Idea of Modern Art: Abstract Expressionism, Freedom, and the Cold War.* Trans. Arthur Goldhammer. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983.

Habermas, Jurgen. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry Into a Category of Bourgeois Society.* Trans. Thomas Burger. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1989.

Hall, Donald. *Their Ancient Glittering Eyes: Remembering Poets and More Poets.* New York: Ticknor & Fields, 1992.

---. "The Poetry Reading: Public Performance/Private Art." *American Scholar* 54 (1985): 63-77.

Hankins, Thomas L. and Silverman, Robert J. *Instruments and the Imagination.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995.

Heller, Steven. *Borrowed Design: The Use and Abuse of Historical Form*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1993.

Henderson, John W. *The United States Information Agency.* New York: Praeger, 1969.

Hewes, Henry. "Masters' Voices." *The Saturday Review*. 16 Aug. 1952: 26-28.

Hixon, Walter L. *Parting the Curtain: Propaganda, Culture, and the Cold War, 1945-1961*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1977.

Hobbs, Stuart D. *The End of the American Avant Garde*. New York: New York University Press, 1997.

Hoover, Paul (Ed.). *Postmodern American Poetry*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1994.

Horten, Greg. *Radio Goes to War: The Cultural Politics of Propaganda during World War II*. Berkeley: The University of California Press, 2002.

Houseman, John. *Run-Through: A Memoir*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1972.

---. *Unfinished Business: A Memoir*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1986.

Hulton, John, and Weeks, Harry. "The Long-Playing Bard." *Library Journal*. 15 May 1959: 1564-7.

Huntington, Samuel P. *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1991.

Hutchins, Robert M. *Great Books: The Foundation of a Liberal Education*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1954.

Huyssen, Andreas. *After the Great Divide: Modernism, Mass Culture, Postmodernism*. Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1986.

"In and Out of Books," *The New York Times* 23 Feb. 1953: VII/8.

Innes, Harold. *Empire and Communications*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972 (1950).

Jameson, Fredric. *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1981.

Jewett, Arno. *Recordings for Teaching Literature and Language in High School*. Federal Security Agency, Office of Education, Bulletin 1952, No. 19. Washington: GPO, 1952.

Kahn, Douglas. *Noise, Water, Meat: A History of Sound in the Arts*. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1999.

--- and Whitehead, Gregory. *Wireless Imagination: Sound, Radio, and the Avant-Garde*. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1992.

Kershner, R.B. *Dylan Thomas: The Poet and His Critics*. Chicago: American Library, 1976.

Kittler, Friedrich. *Gramophone, Film, Typewriter*. Trans. Geoffrey Winthrop-Young and Michael Wutz. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999.

---. *Discourse Networks 1800/1900*. Trans. Michael Metteer. Stansford: Stanford University Press, 1990.

Kolodin, Irving. "The Vinyl Decade." *The Saturday Review* 28 Sept. 1957: 41-56.

Kristeva, Julia. *Revolution in Poetic Language*. Trans. Margaret Waller. New York: Columbia University Press, 1984.

Lanier, Douglas. "WSHX: Shakespeare and American Radio." *Shakespeare After Mass Media*. Ed. Richard Burt. New York: Palgrave, 2002:195-220.

Lawrence, Harold. "Words, Words, Words." *The Saturday Review*. 2 May 1956:60

Leader, Jennifer L. "'There Never Was a War That Was Not Inward': Empathic Agency and Christian Trope in the World War II Poetry of Edith Sitwell, Kathleen Raine and Marianne Moore." *Religion and the Arts* 2.1 (Spring 1998): 42-68.

Lee, Hermione. *Virginia Woolf*. London: Vintage, 1997.

Levy, William Turner. *Affectionately, T.S. Eliot*. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott, 1968.

Lora-Totino, Arrigo. CD Booklet. *Futura Poesia Sonora*: *Critical-Historical Anthology of Sound Poetry*. CD. Milan: Cramps Records, 1993.

Lottman, Herbert. *The Left Bank: Writers, Artists, and Politics From the Popular Front to the Cold War*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1982.

Macdonald, Dwight. "Mass Cult and Midcult: II." *The Partisan Review* 27:4 (1960): 589-631

MacLeish, Archibald. *A Time to Speak*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1941.

---. *A Time to Act*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1943.

---. *A Free Man's Book's: An Address*. New York: The Peter Pauper Press, 1942.

Malm, Krister. "The Music Industry." *Ethnomusicology: An Introduction*. Ed. Helen Myers. New York: W.W. Norton, 1992: 349-64.

Markel, Helen. "The Girls Who Made Poetry Pay." *Woman's Day*. May 1960: 46+.

Mann, Thomas. *The Story of a Novel.* Trans. Richard and Clara Winston. New York: Knopf, 1961.

Mason, David. CD liner notes. *Great Literary Figures: Legends of the 20th Century.* CD. London: EMI, 1999.

Masten, Jeffrey, Sallybrass, Peter, and Vikers, Nancy (Eds.) *Language Machines: Technologies of Literary and Cultural Production.* New York: Routledge, 1997.

Matthews, Kristin L. "Saving America's Soul: The Cold War Reading Crusade." *Culture and the State,* University of Alberta, May 2-5, 2002.

Maud, Ralph. *Dylan Thomas in Print.* London: J.M. Dent & Sons, 1972.

McLuhan, Marshall. *The Gutenberg Galaxy: The Making of Typographic Man.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1962.

Meacham, Harry M. *The Caged Panther: Ezra Pound at Saint Elizabeths.* New York. Twayne Publishers, 1967.

Menard, Louis. "Culture Club: The Short Happy Life of the American Highbrow." *The New Yorker.* 15 Oct. 2001: 202-210.

Millard, Andre. *America on Record: A History of Recorded Sound.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Moore, Harry T. "Poetry on Records." *Poetry.* September, 1949: 367-70.

---. "Poetry on Records." *Poetry.* March, 1953: 353-355.

Morris, Adelaide (Ed.) *Sound States: Innovative Poetics and Acoustical Technologies.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997.

Morrison, Mark. "Performing the Pure Voice: Elocution, Verse Recitation, and Modernist Poetry in Prewar London." *Modernism/Modernity* 3.3 (1996): 25-50.

Morrow, Bradford (Ed.). *Kenneth Rexroth: Selected Poems.* Norfolk, CT: New Directions, 1984.

Morton, David. *Off the Record: The Technology and Culture of Sound Recording in America.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University, 2000.

Morton, Ruth C. "The Abbreviated Muse." *The New Yorker.* 24 July 1950: 50+.

Mullaly, Edward J. *Archibald MacLeish: A Checklist.* The Kent State University

Press, 1973.

Murdy, Louise Baughan. *Sound and Sense in Dylan Thomas's Poetry*. The Haugue: Mouton & Co., 1966.

Nemerov, Howard (Ed.) *Poets on Poetry*. New York: Basic Books, 1966.

--- (Ed.) *Contemporary American Poetry*. United States Information Agency.

Noland, Carrie. *Poetry at Stake: Lyric Aesthetics and the Challenge of Technology*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999.

Nollen, Scott Allen. *Boris Karloff: A Critical Account of His Screen, Stage, Radio, Television, and Recording Work*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Co., 1991.

North, Michael. *Reading 1922: A Return to the Scene of the Modern*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Ong, Walter. *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word*. London: Meuthen and Co., 1982.

Owen, Harold H. et al. "Report of the Committee on the Teaching of Poetry," *Second Yale Conference on the Teaching of English*, Yale University, March 23-4, 1956.

Pearson, John. *Facades: Edith, Osbert, and Sacheverell*. London: MacMillan Ltd. 1978.

Philips, Gyllian. *The Rhythm of the Visible World: Music, Text, and Performance in Selected Writings of Edith Sitwell, Gertrude Stein, and Virginia Woolf*. Diss. University of Western Ontario, 1996. AAT NN15075.

Pound, Ezra. *Culture*. Norfolk, CT: New Directions, 1938.

---. *The Cantos of Ezra Pound*. Norfolk: New Directions, 1970.

---. "How to Read." *Literary Essays of Ezra Pound*. Ed. T.S. Eliot. Norfolk: New Directions, 1954.

Rasula, Jed. *The American Poetry Wax Museum: Reality Effects, 1940-1990*. Urbana: National Council of Teachers of English, 1996.

---. "Poetry's Voice-Over." *Sound States: Innovative Poetics and Accoustical Technologies*. Ed. Adelaide Morris. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997.

Read, Oliver and Welch, Walter. *From Tin Foil to Stereo: Evolution of the Phonograph*. New York: Howard W. Sams & Co., 1959.

Recording Technology History. Ed. Steve Schoenherr. July 6 2005. Department of History. University of San Diego. Aug. 14, 2001. <http://www-history.acusd.edu/gen/recording/notes.html>.

"Red and Anti-Red Curbs on Art Denounced by U.S. Playwright." *The New York Times*. 13 Feb. 1956: 9

Roach, Helen. *Spoken Records*. 3rd ed. Metuchen, NJ: The Scarecrow Press, 1970.

Rothwell, Kenneth S. *A History of Shakespeare on Screen: A Century of Film and Television*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Salter, Elizabeth. *The Last Years of a Rebel: A Memoir of Edith Sitwell*. London: The Bodley Head, 1967.

Sandburg, Carl. *Home Front Memo*. New York: Harcourt Brace & Co., 1940.

Satterfield, Jay. *The World's Best Books: Taste, Culture, and the Modern Library*. Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2002.

Scaduto, Anthony. *Bob Dylan: An Intimate Biography*. New York: New American Library, 1971.

Schafer, F. Murray. *The Tuning of the World: Towards a Theory of Soundscape Design*. Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Press, 1980 (1977).

Schifferin, André. *The Business of Books: How International Conglomerates Took Over Publishing and Changed the Way We Read*. London: Verso, 2000.

Schneider, Alvin A. *Warriors of Disinformation: American Propaganda, Soviet Lies, and the Winning of the Cold War: An Insider's Account*. New York: Arcade, 1995.

Sharpe, Tony. *Wallace Stevens: A Literary Life*. London: Macmillan Press 2000.

Sitwell, Edith. *Taken Care Of: An Autobiography*. London: Hutchinson, 1965.

---. *The Collected Poems of Edith Sitwell*. New York: The Vanguard Press, 1968.

---. "The Love of Man, the Praise of God." Rev. of *The Collected Poems of Dylan Thomas, 1934-1954*. *New York Herald Tribune*.10 May 1954: Section 6, p. 1.

"Some Books Literally Burned After Inquiry, Dulles Reports." *The New York Times*. 16 June 1953:1.

"Sound." *The New Encylopaedia Britannica: Macropedia.* 15th ed. 1987.

The Spoken Word: Poets. Historic Recordings from the British Library Sound Archive. London: The British Library, 2003.

The Spoken Word: Writers. Historic Recordings from the British Library Sound Archive. London: The British Library, 2003.

Stevens, Holly (Ed.). *Letters of Wallace Stevens.* New York: Knopf, 1966.

Stewart, Garrett. *Reading Voices: Literature and the Phonotext.* Berkeley: The University of California Press, 1990.

Stonor Sauders, Frances. *The Cultural Cold War: The CIA and the World of Arts and Letters.* New York: The New Press, 1999.

Stout, Janis. P. *Katherine Anne Porter: A Sense of the Times.* Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1995.

Thomas, Dylan. *The Collected Poems of Dylan Thomas.* Norfolk, CT: New Directions, 1957.

---. "A Few Words of a Kind," *Dylan Thomas Reading, Vol. 3,* LP, Caedmon, 1956.

Thompson, Emily. *The Soundscape of Modernity: Architectural Acoustics and the Culture of Listening in America.* Boston: The MIT Press, 2002.

Thomson, Charles A. and Laves, Walter C. (Eds). *Cultural Relations and U.S. Foreign Policy.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1963.

Torrey, E. Fuller. *The Roots of Treason: Ezra Pound and the Secret of St. Elizabeths.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1984.

Tremlett, George. *Dylan Thomas: In the Mercy of His Means.* London: Constable & Co. 1991.

Tsur, Reuven. *What Makes Sound Patterns Expressive? The Poetic Mode of Speech Perception.* Durham: Duke University Press, 1992.

United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. *Report of the Commission on the Technical Needs in Press, Radio, Film Following the Survey in Twelve Devastated Countries.* Paris: UNESCO, 1947.

---. *Report of the Commission on the Technical Needs in Press, Radio, Film Following the Survey in Fourteen Countries and Territories.* Paris: UNESCO, 1949.

---. *Report of the Commission on the Technical Needs in Press, Radio, Film Second Supplement.* Paris: UNESCO, 1950.

---. *Trade Barriers to Knowledge: A Manual of Regulations Affecting Educational, Scientific and Cultural Materials.* Paris: UNESCO, 1951.

United States. Cong. Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Foreign Operations of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. *U.S. Information Agency Operations.* 91st Cong., 2nd sess., 92nd Cong., 1st sess. Washington: GPO, 1973.

Villa, Jose Garcia (Ed.). *A Celebration for Edith Sitwell.* Norfolk, CT: New Directions, 1948.

Virilio, Paul. *The Paul Virilio Reader*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2004.

Wagnleitner, Reinhold. *American Cultural Diplomacy, the Cinema, and the Cold War in Central Europe.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1992.

Weilraub, Bernard. "Recording the *Marat/de Sade*." *The New York Times*. 13 Feb. 1966: 24X.

Whitfield, Stephen J. *The Culture of the Cold War*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991.

Wilford, Hugh. *The New York Intellectuals: From Vanguard to Institution*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995.

Williams, Alan. "Is Sound Recording Like a Language?" *Yale French Studies* 60 (1980): 51-66.

Williams, Raymond. *The Politics of Modernism: Against the New Conformists.* London: Verso, 1989.

Willson, Robert F. Jr. *Shakespeare in Hollywood, 1929-1956*. Madison: Farleigh Dickinson University Press.

Winkler, Allan M. *The Politics of Propaganda: The Office of War Information 1931-1945*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978.

Wood, Bret. *Orson Welles: A Bio-Bibliography*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1990.

"Wrack at Steinway Hall." *The New Yorker*. 14 Mar. 1953: 25-6.

Discography

Aiken, Conrad. *Conrad Aiken Reading*. LP. Caedmon Records, 1955.

Antonius, Brother. *Brother Antonius Reads His Poetry.* LP. Caedmon, 1968.

Auden, W.H. *W.H. Auden Reading*. LP. Caedmon Records, 1954.

Brooks, Gwendolyn. *Gwendolyn Brooks Reading Her Poetry*. LP. Caedmon Records, 1969.

The Caedmon Treasury of Modern Poets Reading. LP. Caedmon Records, 1957.

Camus, Albert. *Albert Camus Reading From His Novels and Essays.* LP. Caedmon Records, 1960.

Cocteau, Jean. *Jean Cocteau Reading*. LP. Caedmon Records, 1963.

Colette. *Colette Reads Colette*. LP. Caedmon Records, 1954.

Coward, Noel. *Duologues.* Performance Noel Coward and Margaret Leighton. LP. Caedmon Records, 1957.

---. *Noel Coward Reading His Poems.* Performance Noel Coward and Margaret Leighton. LP. Caedmon Records, 1958.

Cummings, E.E. *E. E. Cummings Reading His Poetry*. LP. Caedmon Records, 1954.

---. *Six Non-Lectures*. LPs. Caedmon Records, 1965.

De la Mare, Walter. *Walter de la Mare Reading and Speaking*. LP. Caedmon Records, 1956.

Eberhart, Richard. *Richard Eberhart Reading His Poetry*. LP. Caedmon Records, 1968.

Eliot, T. S. *T. S. Eliot Reading Four Quartets*. LP. Caedmon, 1971.

---. *T.S. Eliot Reading Poems and Choruses*. LP. Caedmon Records, 1956.

---. *T. S. Eliot Reading the Wasteland and Other Poems*. LP. Caedmon Records, 1971.

Faulkner, William. *William Faulkner Reading.* LP. Caedmon, 1954.

Frost, Robert. *Robert Frost Reads His Poetry*. LP. Caedmon Records, 1957.

Graves, Robert. *Robert Graves Reads from His Poetry and the White Goddess.* LP. Caedmon Records, 1958.

Hemingway, Ernest. *Ernest Hemingway Reading.* LP. Caedmon Records, 1965.

Hughes, Langston. *The Dream Keeper and Other Poems of Langston Hughes.* LP. Folkways, 1957.

Jiménez, Juan Ramón. *Juan Ramón Jiménez Reading.* LP. Caedmon, 1962.

Lindsay, Vachel. *Vachel Lindsay Reading the Congo, Chinese Nightingale, and other Poems.* LP. Caedmon Records, 1955.

MacLeish, Archibald. *Archibald MacLeish Reads His Poetry.* LP. Caedmon Records,1952.

Mann, Thomas. *Thomas Mann Reading.* LP. Caedmon Records, 1952.

Masefield, John. *John Masefield Reading Sea Fever and Other Poems.* LP. Caedmon Records, 1964.

Millay, Edna St. Vincent. *Edna St. Vincent Millay Reading Her Poetry.* LP. Caedmon Records, 1961.

Moore, Marianne. *Marianne Moore Reading Her Poems and Fables From La Fontaine.* LP. Caedmon Records, 1955.

Nash, Ogden. *Ogden Nash Reads Ogden Nash.* LP. Caedmon Records, 1954.

Neruda, Pablo. *Pablo Neruda Reading His Poetry.* LP. Caedmon Records, 1967.

O'Casey, Sean. *Sean O'Casey Reading Juno and the Paycock.* LP. Caedmon Records. 1954.

O'Connor, Frank. *Frank O'Connor Reads Two Complete Short Stories: The Drunkard and my Oedipus Complex.* LP. Caedmon Records, 1955.

Olivier, Laurence. *On the Death of King George the Sixth.* LP. Caedmon Records, 1952.

Pleasure Dome: An Audible Anthology of Modern Poetry Read by its Creators. LP. Columbia Records, 1949.

Porter, Katherine Anne. *The Downward Path to Wisdom.* LP. Caedmon Records, 1952.

---. *Pale Horse, Pale Rider.* LP. Caedmon Records, 1952.

---. *Noon Wine.* LP. Caedmon Records, 1958.

Pound, Ezra. *Ezra Pound Reading his Poetry.* LP. Caedmon, 1960.

---. *Ezra Pound Reading his Poetry, Volume 2.* LP. Caedmon, 1962.

Sandburg, Carl. *Rootabega Stories.* LP. Caedmon, 1957.

---. *Poems for Children.* LP. Caedmon, 1958.

---. *A Lincoln Album.* LP. Caedmon, 1958.

---. *Carl Sandburg Reading His Poetry.* LP. Caedmon, 1962.

---. *Always the Young Strangers.* LP. Caedmon, 1966.

---. *Carl Sandburg Sings His American Songbag.* LP. Caedmon, 1967.

---. *The People, Yes.* LP. Caedmon, 1967.

---. *Carl Sandburg Reading Fog and Other Poems.* LP. Caedmon, 1968.

Sexton, Anne. *Anne Sexton Reads Her Poetry.* LP. Caedmon, 1974.

Sitwell, Edith. *Edith Sitwell Reading Her Poems.* LP. Caedmon Records, 1955.

Sitwell, Osbert. *Osbert Sitwell Reading His Poetry.* LP. Caedmon Records, 1954.

Spender, Stephen. *Stephen Spender Reading His Poetry.* LP. Caedmon Records, 1958.

Stein, Gertrude. *Gertrude Stein Reads from her Works.* LP. Caedmon Records, 1956.

Stevens, Wallace. *Wallace Stevens Reading His Poems.* LP. Caedmon Records, 1957.

Thomas, Dylan. *Dylan Thomas Reading A Child's Christmas in Wales and Five Poems.* LP. Caedmon Records, 1952.

---. *Dylan Thomas Reading Volume II.* LP. Caedmon Records. 1954.

---. *Under Milk Wood.* LP. Caedmon Records, 1955.

---. *Dylan Thomas Reading, Volume 3.* LP. Caedmon Records, 1956.

---. *Dylan Thomas Reading A Visit to America and Poems.* LP. Caedmon Records, 1958.

---. *Dylan Thomas Reading Quite Early One Morning*. LP. Caedmon Records, 1960.

---. *An Evening with Dylan Thomas.* LP. Caedmon Records, 1963.

---. *Dylan Thomas Reading His Complete Recorded Poetry*. LP. Caedmon Records, 1964.

Tolkien, J.R.R. *Poems and Songs of the Middle Earth.* LP. Caedmon Records, 1968.

Weiss, Peter. *Peter Weiss Reading from His Works*. LP. Caedmon Records, 1967.

Welty, Eudora. *Eudora Welty Reading*. LP. Caedmon Records, 1952.

Wilbur, Richard. *Richard Wilbur Reading His Poetry.* LP. Caedmon Records, 1968.

Williams, Tennessee. *Tennessee Williams Reading*. LP. Caedmon Records, 1952.

Williams, William Carlos. *William Carlos Williams Reading His Poetry.* LP. Caedmon Records, 1958.

Yevtushenko, Yevgeny. *Yevgeny Yevtushenko Reads Babbi Yar and Other Poems.* Performance Yevgeny Yevtushenko and Alan Bates. LP. Caedmon Records, 1966.

Spoken Texts

Aleichem, Sholem. *Stories of Sholem Alecheim*. Performance Menasha Skulnik. LP. Caedmon Records, 1964.

American Literature. Performance Mark Van Doren, Eddie Albert, Ed Begley, Jeremy Brett, Hume Cronyn, E. E. Cummings, Helen Gahagan Douglas, Melvin Douglas, T.S. Eliot, Robert Frost, Julie Harris, Hal Holbrook, Basil Rathbone, Carl Sandburg, David Wayne, and Edward Woodward. LP. Caedmon Records, 1965.

American Poetry: Favorite Poems. Performance Ed Begley. LP. Caedmon Records, 1966.

Baudelaire, Charles. *Les Fleurs du Mal.* Performance Louis Jourdan, Eve LeGalliene. LP. Caedmon, 1956.

Beckett, Samuel. *Malloy; Malone; The Unameable.* Performance Cyril Cusack. LP. Caedmon Records, 1963.

Beowulf. Performance Kemp Malone. LP. Caedmon Records, 1969.

C

Beowulf and Other Poetry. Performance J. B. Bessinger. LP. Caedmon Records, 1962.

Black Pioneers in American History, Volume I 19th Century. Performance Eartha Kitt and Moses Gun. LP. Caedmon Records, 1969.

Blake, William. *The Poetry of William Blake*. Performance Ralph Richardson. LP. Caedmon Records, 1961.

The Book of Judith and the Book of Ruth. Performance Judith Anderson and Claire Bloom. LP. Caedmon Records, 1957.

The Book of Genesis. Performance Judith Anderson. LP. Caedmon Records, 1958.

Boswell, Samuel. *A London Journal*. Performance Anthony Quayle. LP. Caedmon Records, 1958.

Bradford, Roark. *Ol' Man Adam and His Chillun*. LP. Caedmon Records, 1964.

Browning, Elizabeth Barrett. *Sonnets from the Portuguese*. Performance Katherine Cornell and Anthony Quayle. LP. Caedmon Records, 1958.

Browning, Robert. *The Poetry of Browning*. Performance James Mason. LP. Caedmon, 1956.

---. *My Last Duchess and Other Poems*. Performance James Mason. LP. Caedmon Records, 1966.

Byron, George. *The Poetry of Byron*. Performance Tyrone Power. LP. Caedmon Records, 1955.

The Cambridge Treasury of British Prose. LP. Caedmon Records, 1956.

Chaucer, Geoffrey. "The General Prologue" and "The Prologue to the Parson's Tale." *The Canterbury Tales*. Performance J. B. Bessinger. LP. Caedmon Records, 1962.

---. "The Miller's Tale" and "The Pardoner's Tale." *The Canterbury Tales*. Performance Michaél MacLiamóir and Stanley Holloway. LP. Caedmon Records, 1963.

---. "The Pardoner's Tale and the Nun's Priest's Tale." *The Canterbury Tales*. Performance Robert Ross. LP. Caedmon, 1952.

---. "The Reeves Tale" and "The Miller's Tale." *The Canterbury Tales*. Performance J. B. Bessinger. LP. Caedmon Records, 1967.

---. "The Wife of Bath's Tale." *The Canterbury Tales*. Performance Peggy Ashcroft. LP. Caedmon Records, 1960.

Coleridge, Samuel. *The Poetry of Coleridge.* Performance Ralph Richardson. LP. Caedmon Records, 1958.

Cooper, James Fenimore. *The Last of the Mohicans*. Performance James Mason, Patricia Somerset and Donna Martyn. LP. Caedmon Records, 1967.

Crane, Hart. *The Poetry of Hart Crane*. Performance Tennessee Williams. LP. Caedmon Records, 1966.

Crane, Stephen. *The Red Badge of Courage*. Performance Edmond O'Brien. LP. Caedmon, 1958.

Defoe, Daniel. *Moll Flanders.* Performance Siobahn McKenna. LP. Caedmon, 1958.

Dickens, Charles. *A Christmas Carol.* Performance Ralph Richardson, Paul Scofield and Frederick Treves. LP. Caedmon Records, 1960.

Dickinson, Emily. *Poems and Letters of Emily Dickinson.* Performance Julie Harris. LP. Caedmon Records, 1960.

---. *A Self-Portrait.* Performance Julie Harris. LP. Caedmon Records, 1968.

Donne, John. *Sermons and Meditations of John Donne*. Performance Herbert Marshall. 1956.

---. *The Love Poems of John Donne.* Performance Richard Burton. LP. Caedmon Records, 1962.

Dos Passos, John. *The 42nd Parallel.* Performance John Dos Passos, Ed Begley and Rip Torn. LP. Caedmon Records, 1968.

Doyle, Arthur Conan. *The Stories of Sherlock Holmes: The Adventure of the Speckled Band and the Final Problem.* Performance Basil Rathbone. LP. Caedmon Records, 1964.

---. *The Stories of Sherlock Holmes: The Redheaded League.* Performance Basil Rathbone. LP. Caedmon Records, 1966.

---. *The Stories of Sherlock Holmes: Sherlock Holmes Adventures*. Performance Basil Rathbone. LP. Caedmon Records, 1967.

---. *The Stories of Sherlock Holmes: Silver Blaze.* Performance Basil Rathbone. LP.

Caedmon Records, 1968.

Dryden, John. *The Poetry of John Dryden.* Performance Paul Scofield. LP. Caedmon Records, 1962.

Ecclesiastes. Performance James Mason. LP. Caedmon Records, 1957.

Eliot, George. *Silas Marner*. Performance Basil Rathbone, Cathleen Nesbitt and George Rose. LP. Caedmon Records, 1968.

Folk Tales of Tribes of Africa. LP. Caedmon Records, 1969.

A Gathering of Great Poetry For Children. Performance by Julie Harris, Cyril Ritchard and David Wayne. LP. Caedmon Records, 1968.

German Lyric Poetry. Performance Lottie Lehmann. LP. Caedmon Records, 1958.

The Golden Treasury of Greek Poetry and Prose. Read by Pearl Wilson. LP. Caedmon, 1956.

Great American Poetry. Performance Vincent Price, Julie Harris, Eddie Albert, Helen Gahagan Douglas and Ed Begley. LP. Caedmon Records, 1962.

Great American Speeches. Performance Carl Sandburg, Melvin Douglas, Vincent Price, and Ed Begley. LP. Caedmon Records, 1958.

Great Short Stories. Performance Claire Bloom and Cyril Cusack. LP. Caedmon Records, 1967.

Hale, Edward. *The Man Without a Country.* Performance Edward G. Robinson. LP. Caedmon Records, 1964.

Hardy, Thomas. *The Poetry of Thomas Hardy.* Performance Richard Burton. LP. Caedmon Records, 1962.

Hawthorne, Nathaniel. *Tales of Hawthorne: The Minister's Black Veil.* Performance Basil Rathbone. LP. Caedmon Records, 1960.

---. *Tales of Hawthorne: The Scarlet Letter*. Performance Basil Rathbone. LP. Caedmon Records, 1965.

Hearing Poetry: Chaucer to Milton. Performance Mark Van Doren, Hurd Hatfield, Frank Silvera, Jo Van Fleet. LP. Caedmon, 1954.

Hearing Poetry: Dryden to Browning.. Performance Mark Van Doren, Hurd Hatfield, Frank Silvera, Jo Van Fleet. LP. Caedmon, 1954.

Homer. *The Iliad.* Performance Anthony Quayle. LP. Caedmon Records, 1967.

---. *The Odyssey*. Performance Anthony Quayle. LP. Caedmon Records, 1969.

Hopkins, Gerard Manley. *The Poetry of Gerard Manley Hopkins*. Performance Cyril Cusack. LP. Caedmon Records, 1959.

Houseman, A.E. *A Shopshire Lad and Other Poetry*. Performance James Mason. LP. Caedmon Records, 1966.

Hughes, Langston. *The Poetry of Langston Hughes*. Performance Ruby Dee and Ossie Davis. LP. Caedmon Records, 1969.

---. *Simple Stories.* Performance Ossie Davis. LP. Caedmon Records, 1968.

Joyce, James. *Ulysses: Soliloquies of Molly and Leopold Bloom*. Performance Siobahn McKenna and E.G. Marshall. LP. Caedmon, 1957.

---. *Finnegans Wake.* Performance Siobahn McKenna and Cyril Cusack. LP. Caedmon Records, 1958.

---. *James Joyce Reads James Joyce.* Performance James Joyce and Cyril Cusack. LP. Caedmon Records, 1971.

---. *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man.* Performance Cyril Cusack. LP. Caedmon Records, 1961.

Kafka, Franz. *The Stories of Franz Kafka.* Performance Lotte Lenya. LP. Caedmon Records, 1963.

Keats, John. *The Poetry of Keats*. Performance Ralph Richardson. LP. Caedmon Records, 1958.

Khayyám, Omar. *The Rubáiyat of Omar Khayyám*. Trans. Edward Fitzgerald. Performance Alfred Drake. LP. Caedmon, 1954.

Lawrence, D.H. *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Performance Pamela Brown. LP. Caedmon Records, 1960.

London, Jack. *The Call of the Wild.* Performance Ed Begley. LP. Caedmon Records, 1967.

Lorca, Federico García. *Poesia y Drama de Lorca.* Performance María Douglas and Raúl Dantés. LP. Caedmon Records, 1958.

Mansfield, Katherine. *Stories by Katherine Mansfield.* Performance Celia Johnson. LP.
Caedmon Records, 1962.

Marshall, Peter. *Peter Marshall Speaks*. LP. Caedmon Records, 1955.

---. *Peter Marshall Speaks: Two Sermons.* LP. Caedmon Records, 1963.

Masters, Edgar Lee. *Spoon River Anthology*. Performance Julie Harris. Dir. X. E. Dance. LP. Caedmon Records, 1965.

Meditations for Modern Classrooms. LP. Caedmon Records, 1968.

Metaphysical Poetry. Performance Cedric Hardwicke, Robert Newton. LP. Caedmon Records, 1956.

Millay, Edna St. Vincent. *Poetry of Edna St. Vincent Millay*. Performance Judith Anderson. LP, Caedmon, 1954.

Milton, John. *The Poetry of John Milton*. Performance Anthony Quayle. LP. Caedmon Records, 1969.

Palgrave's Golden Treasury. Performance Claire Bloom, Eric Portman and John Neville. LP. Caedmon Records, 1958.

Parker, Dorothy. *Dorothy Parker Stories*. Performance Shirley Booth. LP. Caedmon Records, 1962.

Pasternak, Boris. *The Poetry of Pasternak*. Performance Yevgeny Yevtushenko and Morris Carnovsky. LP. Caedmon, 1966.

Poe, Edgar Allan. *Poems and Tales of Edgar Allan Poe, Volume 1: The Masque of the Red Death and Other Poems.* Performance Basil Rathbone. LP. Caedmon, 1954.

---. *Poems and Tales of Edgar Allan Poe, Volume 2: The Pit and the Pendulum and Other Works*. Performance Basil Rathbone. LP. Caedmon Records, 1960.

---. *Poems and Tales of Edgar Allan Poe, Volume3: The Fall of the House of Usher and Other Works.* Performance Basil Rathbone. LP. Caedmon Records, 1965.

Poems for Children. LP. Caedmon Records, 1967.

Poetry for Children. LP. Caedmon Records, 1967.

Poems of Patriotism. Performance Ed Begley. LP. Caedmon Records, 1966.

Pope, Alexander. *The Poetry of Alexander Pope.* Performance Ralph Richardson. LP. Caedmon Records, 1963.

Proust, Marcel. *Remembrance of Things Past.* Performance Ralph Richardson. LP. Caedmon Records, 1959.

Service, Robert. *The Poetry of Robert Service.* Performance Ed Begley. LP. Caedmon Records, 1967.

Seton, Ernest Thompson. *Wild Animals I Have Known: Lobo and Silverspot.* Performance Ed Begley. LP. Caedmon Records, 1967.

Shakespeare, William. *The Rape of the Lucrece and Other Poems.* Performance Richard Burton, Edith Evans, Donald Wolfit. LP. Caedmon Records, 1961.

---. *Sonnets.* Performance John Gielgud. LP. Caedmon Records, 1964.

---. *Venus and Adonis and a Lover's Complaint.* Performance Claire Bloom and Max Adrian. LP. Caedmon Records, 1964.

Shaw, George Bernard and Terry, Ellen. *The Shaw-Terry Letters.* LP. Performance Peggy Ashcroft and Cyril Cusack. LP. Caedmon Records, 1959.

Shelley, Percy Bysshe. *The Poetry of Shelley.* Performance by Vincent Price. LP. Caedmon Records, 1956.

Spencer, Edmund. *The Faerie Queene and Epithalmion.* Performance Michaéal MacLiamóir. LP. Caedmon Records, 1962.

The Song of Songs/Letters of Heloise and Abelard. Performed by Claire Bloom, Claude Rains and Nancy Wickwire. LP. Caedmon Records, 1958.

Swift, Jonathan. *Gulliver's Travels.* Performance Michael Redgrave. LP. Caedmon Records, 1959.

Thoreau, Henry David. *Civil Disobedience.* Performance Archibald MacLeish. LP. Caedmon Records, 1968.

---. *Walden.* Performance Archibald MacLeish. LP. Caedmon Records, 1969.

Tristan and Iseult. Performance Claire Bloom. LP. Caedmon Records, 1961.

Twain, Mark. *Huckleberry Finn.* Performance Ed Begley. LP. Caedmon Records, 1967.

---. *Life Along the Mississippi*. Performance Ed Begley. LP. Caedmon Records, 1969.

---. *Stories of Mark Twain.* Performance Walter Brennan, Brandon de Wilde. LP. Caedmon, 1956.

---. *Tom Sawyer.* Performance Ed Begley. LP. Caedmon Records, 1966.

Weiss, Peter. *Peter Weiss Reading From His Works*. LP. Caedmon Records, 1967.

Whitman, Walt. *Walt Whitman: Crossing Brooklyn Ferry and Other Poems*. Performance Ed Begley. LP. Caedmon Records, 1969.

---. *Walt Whitman: Eyewitness to the Civil War*. Performance Ed Begley. LP. Caedmon Records, 1969.

---. *Leaves of Grass: I Hear America Singing.* Performance Ed Begley. LP. Caedmon Records, 1959.

---. *Leaves of Grass: Song of the Open Road.* Performance Ed. Begley. LP. Caedmon Records, 1964.

Wilde, Oscar. *The Picture of Dorian Grey.* Performance Hurd Hatfield. LP. Caedmon Records, 1958.

Wodehouse, P.G. *Jeeves*. Performance Terry-Thomas, Miles Malleson, Judith Furse. LP. Caedmon Records, 1964.

Woolf, Virginia. *Mrs. Dalloway.* Performance Celia Johnson. LP. Caedmon Records, 1959.

Wordsworth, William. *The Poetry of William Wordsworth*. Performance Cedric Hardwicke. LP. Caedmon Records, 1959.

Yeats, William Butler. *The Poetry of William Butler Yeats.* Performance Siobahn McKenna and Cyril Cusack. LP. Caedmon Records, 1959.

Documentary and Interview Recordings

Churchill in His Own Voice. Performance Winston Churchill, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Dwight Eisenhower, John Gielgud, Laurence Olivier. LP. Caedmon Records, 1965.

Cocteau, Jean. *Jean Cocteau: A Self-Portrait*. LP. Caedmon Records, 1966.

Eisenhower. Performance Bob Considine, Franklin Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, Winston Churchill, Adlai Stevenson, Fidel Castro. LP. Caedmon Records, 1969.

Five British Sculptors Talk. Performance Henry Moore, Barbara Hepworth, Reg Butler, Kenneth Armitage, Lynn Chadwick. LP. Caedmon Records, 1965.

Holzman, Arthur. *Isreal is Born.* Performance Arthur Holzman, Chaim Weizmann, David Ben Gurion. LP. Caedmon Records, 1954.

John F. Kennedy: A Self-Portrait. LP. Caedmon Records, 1964.

Mencken, Henry. *Henry Mencken Conversing.* LP. Caedmon Records, 1958.

Rivera, Diego. *Diego Rivera Speaking.* LP. Caedmon Records, 1959.

Russell, Bertrand. *Bertrand Russell Speaks.* LP. Caedmon Records, 1962.

The White House Saga. Narr. Ed Begley. LP. Caedmon Records, 1965.

Wright, Frank Lloyd. *Frank Lloyd Wright Speaking.* LP. Caedmon Records, 1959.

Theatrical Recordings

Aristophanes. *Lysistrata.* Performance Hermione Gingold, Stanley Holloway and Miriam Karlin. Dir. Howard Sackler. LP. Caedmon Records, 1967.

Calderon de la Barca, Pedro. *El Alcalde de Zalamea.* Performance Francisca Ferrandiz, María Rollan, Alegandro Ulloa, Enrique Cerra. LP. Caedmon Records, 1955.

---. *La Vida es Sueño.* Performance Alegandro Ulloa, Francisca Ferrandiz, Miguel García, Emilio Menedez. LP. Caedmon Records, 1954.

Chekhov, Anton. *The Cherry Orchard.* LP. Caedmon Records, 1966.

---. *Three Suites.* LP. Caedmon Records, 1968.

---. *Uncle Vanya.* LP. Caedmon Records, 1967.

Cocteau, Jean. *The Human Voice.* Performance Ingrid Bergman. LP. Caedmon Records, 1961.

---. *The Infernal Machine.* Performance Margaret Leighton, Jeremy Brett and Diane Cilento. Dir. Howard Sackler. LP. Caedmon Records, 1968.

Eliot, T. S. *The Family Reunion.* Performance Flora Robson, Paul Scofield and Sybil Thorndike. Dir. Howard Sackler. LP. Caedmon Records, 1966.

---. *Murder in the Cathedral.* Performance Paul Scofield, Cyril Cusack and Julian Glover. Dir. Howard Sackler. LP. Caedmon Records, 1968.

Euripedes. *Medea.* Performance Judith Anderson, Anthony Quayle and Catherine Lacey. LP. Caedmon Records, 1964.

Everyman. Performance Burgess Meredith, Terance Kilburn, Frederick Rolf, Frank Silvera, Stefan Gierasch. Dir. Howard Sackler. LP. Caedmon Records, 1955.

Genet, Jean. *The Balcony.* Performance Pamela Brown, Patrick Magee and Cyril Cusack. Dir. Howard Sackler. LP. Caedmon Records, 1967.

Goldsmith, Oliver. *She Stoops to Conquer.* Performance Alastair Sim, Claire Bloom, and Brenda de Banzie. Dir. Howard Sackler. LP. Caedmon Records, 1966.

Greek Tragedy. Performance Katina Paxinou and Alexis Minotis. LP. Caedmon Records, 1961.

Ibsen, Henrik. *Hedda Gabler.* Performance Joan Plowright, Anthony Quayle and Kathleen Nesbitt. Dir. Howard Sackler. LP. Caedmon Records, 1967.

---. *The Master Builder.* Performance Michael Redgrave, Maggie Smith and Celia Johnson. Dir. Peter Wood. LP. Caedmon Records, 1965.

Ionesco, Eugene. *The Chairs.* Performance Siobahn McKenna, Cyril Cusack and Eugene Ionesco. LP. Caedmon Records, 1967.

Marlowe, Christopher. *The Tragical History of Dr. Faustus.* Performance Frank Silvera, Julian Barry, Terence Kilburn. Dir. Howard Sackler. LP. Caedmon Records, 1957.

Miller, Arthur. *After the Fall.* LP. Caedmon Records, 1968.

---. *Death of a Salesman.* Performance Lee Cobb, Mildred Dunnock and Michael Tolan. Dir. Ula Grosbard. LP. Caedmon Records, 1966.

---. *Incident at Vichy.* LP. Caedmon Records, 1968.

---. *View From the Bridge.* LP. Caedmon, 1967.

Milton, John. *Samson Agonistes.* Performance Michael Redgrave, Max Adrian and Faith Brook. Dir. Peter Wood. LP. Caedmon Records, 1967.

Molière. *The Misanthrope.* Performance Richard Easton, Syndey Walker, and Alan Brasington. Dir. Stephen Porter. LP. Caedmon Records, 1969.

---. *Tartuffe*. Performance William Hutt, Douglas Rain and Martha Henry. Dir. Jean Gascon. LP. Caedmon Records, 1969.

O'Neill, Eugene. *A Moon for the Misbegotten.* Performance Salome Jens, Michel Ryan and W.B. Brydon. Dir. Theodore Mann. LP. Caedmon, 1969.

Rostand, Edmond. *Cyrano de Bergerac*. Performance Ralph Richardson, Anna Massey and Peter Wynegarde. Dir. Howard Sackler. LP. Caedmon Records, 1965.

Sartre, Jean-Paul. *No Exit.* Performance Donald Pleasence, Anna Massey and Glenda Jackson. Dir. Howard Sackler. LP. Caedmon Records, 1968.

The Second Shepard's Play. Performance Joss Ackland, Peter Bayliss, Diarmid Cammell, Robert Stephens. Dir. Howard Sackler. LP. Caedmon Records, 1962.

Shakespeare, William. *All's Well That Ends Well.* Performance Claire Bloom, Flora Robson and Eric Portman. Dir. Howard Sackler. LP. Caedmon Records, 1965.

---. *Anthony and Cleopatra.* Performance Anthony Quayle, Pamela Brown and Paul Daneman. Dir. Howard Sackler. LP. Caedmon Records, 1963.

---. *As You Like It.* Performance Vanessa Redgrave, Keith Mitchell and Max Adrian. Dir. Peter Wood. LP. Caedmon Records, 1962.

---. *The Comedy of Errors.* Performance Alec McCowen, Anna Massey and Harry Corbett. Dir. Howard Sackler. LP. Caedmon Records, 1968.

---. *Coriolanus.* Performance Richard Burton, Jessica Tandy and Kenneth Haigh. Dir. Howard Sackler. LP. Caedmon Records, 1962.

---. *Cymbeline*. Performance Boris Karloff, Pamela Brown and John Fraser. Dirc. Howard Sackler. LP. Caedmon Records, 1963.

---. *Hamlet.* Performance Paul Scofield, Daina Wynyard, and Wilfrid Lawson. Dir. Howard Sackler. LP. Caedmon Records, 1963.

---. *Julius Caesar.* Performance Ralph Richardson, Anthony Quayle and John Mills. Dir. Howard Sackler. LP. Caedmon Records, 1963.

---. *King Henry IV (Part One).* Performance Harry Andrews, Pamela Brown and Edith Evans. Dir. Peter Wood. LP. Caedmon Records, 1964.

---. *King Henry IV(Part Two.)* Performance Max Adrian, Harry Andrews and Felix Aylmer. Dir. Peter Wood. LP. Caedmon Records, 1965.

---. *King John.* Performance Donald Wolfit, Kenneth Haigh and Rosemary Harris. Dir. Howard Sackler. LP. Caedmon Records, 1964.

---. *King Lear.* Performance Paul Scofield, Rachel Roberts and Pamela Brown. Dir. Howard Sackler. LP. Caedmon Records, 1965.

---. *King Richard II.* Performance John Gielgud, Keith Michell, Leo McKern. Dir. Peter Wood. LP. Caedmon Records, 1962.

---. *King Richard III.* Performance Robert Stephens, Peggy Ashcroft and Cyril Cusack. Dir. Howard Sackler. LP. Caedmon Records, 1967.

---. *Macbeth.* Performance Anthony Quayle, Gwen Ffrangçon Davies, Stanley Holloway. Dir. Howard Sackler. LP. Caedmon Records, 1960.

---. *Measure for Measure.* Performance John Gielgud, Margaret Leighton, Ralph Richardson. Dir. Peter Wood. LP. Caedmon Records, 1961.

---. *The Merchant of Venice* (Abridged). Performance Michael Redgrave, Peter Neil, Alan McNaughton. LP. Caedmon Records, 1958.

---. *The Merchant of Venice.* Performance Hugh Griffith, Dorothy Tutin and Harry Andrews. Dir. Peter Wood. LP. Caedmon Records, 1964.

---. *The Merry Wives of Windsor.* Performance Anthony Quayle, Michaél MacLiamóir and Joyce Redman. Dir. Howard Sackler. LP. Caedmon Records, 1966.

---. *A Midsummer Night's Dream.* Performance Paul Scofield, Joy Parker and Barbara Jefford. Dir. Howard Sackler. LP. Caedmon Records, 1964.

---. *Much Ado About Nothing.* Performance Rex Harrison, Rachel Roberts and Alan Webb. Dir. Howard Sackler. LP. Caedmon Records, 1963.

---. *Othello.* Performance Frank Silvera, Cyril Cusack, Celia Johnson. Dir. Howard Sackler. LP. Caedmon Records, 1960.

---. *Pericles.* Performance Paul Scofield, Felix Aylmer and Judi Dench. Dir. Howard Sackler. LP. Caedmon, 1969.

---. *Romeo and Juliet.* Performance Claire Bloom, Edith Evans and Albert Finney. Dir. Howard Sackler. LP. Caedmon Records, 1961.

---. *The Taming of the Shrew.* Performance Trevor Howard, Margaret Leighton and Miles Malleson. Dir. Howard Sackler. LP. Caedmon Records, 1960.

---. *The Tempest.* Performance Michael Redgrave, Hugh Griffith and Vanessa Redgrave. Dir. Peter Wood. LP. Caedmon Records, 1964.

---. *Titus Adronicus*. Performance Anthony Quayle, Maxine Audley and Michale Hordern. Dir. Howard Sackler. LP. Caedmon Records, 1967.

---. *Twelfth Night.* Performance Siobahn McKenna, Paul Scofield and Vanessa Redgrave. Dir. Howard Sackler. LP. Caedmon Records, 1961.

---. *Two Gentleman of Verona.* Performance Peter Wyngarde, Edward DeSouza and Johanna Dunham. Dir. Howard Sackler. LP. Caedmon Records, 1965.

---. *Troilus and Cressida.* Performance Diane Cilento, Jeremy Brett and Cyril Cusack. Dir. Howard Sackler. LP. Caedmon Records, 1962.

---. *The Winter's Tale.* Performance John Gielgud, Peggy Ashcroft and George Rose. Dir. Peter Wood. LP. Caedmon Records, 1961.

Shaw, George Bernard. *Caesar and Cleopatra.* Performance Claire Bloom, Max Adrian and Judith Anderson. Dir. Anthony Quayle. LP. Caedmon Records, 1965.

---. *Heartbreak House.* Performance Jessica Tandy, Tony Van Bridge and Frances Hyland. Dir. Val Gielgud. LP. Caedmon Records, 1969.

---. *Saint Joan.* Performance Siobahn McKenna, Donald Pleasence and Felix Aylmer. Dir. Howard Sackler. LP. Caedmon Records, 1966.

Sheridan, Richard. *The School for Scandal.* Performance Ralph Richardson, Geraldine McEwan and Gwen Ffrançon-Davies. Dir. John Gielgud. LP. Caedmon Records, 1967.

Sophocles. *Antigone.* Performance Dorothy Tutin, Max Adrian and Jeremy Brett. Dir. Howard Sackler. LP. Caedmon Records, 1967.

---. *Oedipus Rex.* Trans. William Butler Yeats. Performance Douglas Campbell, Eric House and Robert Goodier. LP. Caedmon Records, 1958.

Voltaire, François. *Candide.* Performance Robert Franc, Lilyan Chavin, Wanda d'Ottoni. LP. Caedmon Records, 1961.

Webster, John. *The Duchess of Malfi.* Performance Barbara Jefford, Robert Stephens, and Alec McCowen. Dir. Howard Sackler. LP. Caedmon Records, 1969.

Weiss, Peter. *The Persecution and Assassination of Jean-Paul Marat as Performed by the*

Inmates of the Asylum of Charneton Under the Direction of the Marquis de Sade. Performance Ian Richardson, Patrick Magee and Glenda Jackson. Dir. Peter Brook. LP. Caedmon Records, 1966.

Wellsprings of Drama. Performance Frank Silvera, William Hess, William Aubin, J.B. Bessinger, Frederick Worlock, Darren McGavin. LP. Caedmon, 1958.

Wilde, Oscar. *The Importance of Being Earnest.* Performance Glayds Cooper, Joan Greenwood, Richard Johnson and Alec McCowen. LP. Caedmon Records, 1968.

Williams, Tennessee. *The Glass Managerie.* Performance Montgomery Clift, Julie Harris and Jessica Tandy. LP. Caedmon, 1964.

---. *The Rose Tattoo.* Performance Maureen Stapleton, Harry Guardino and Maria Tucci. Dir. Milton Katselas. LP. Caedmon Records, 1967.

Yeats, William Butler. *Five One Act Plays.* Performance Siobahn McKenna, Cyril Cusack and Marie Kean. Dir. Howard Sackler. LP. Caedmon Records, 1966.

Zeami. *Noh Plays.* Performance by Tokyo Komparau and Kanze Schools of Noh. LP. Caedmon Records, 1959.

Zorilla, José, *Don Juan Tenorio*. Performance Francisca Ferrandiz, Alegandro Ulloa, Miguel García, Rafeal Calvo. LP. Caedmon Records, 1956.